

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1348865

EV
4019
A5
v.6



The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

THE SIXTH BIENNIAL MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES AND COLLEGES IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

Union Theological Seminary, New York City, June 26-28, 1928.

MINUTES

1. The program of services, papers and discussions was as follows:

Tuesday, June 26, 8:00 p. m.

Devotional Service.....PROFESSOR J. NEWTON DAVIES, D.D.
Drew Theological Seminary.

Organization of the Conference.

Address of Welcome...PRESIDENT HENRY SLOANE COFFIN, D.D.
Union Theological Seminary.

Report of the Continuation Committee,
PRESIDENT W. DOUGLAS MACKENZIE, D.D.
Hartford Seminary Foundation.

Report of the Secretary-Treasurer,
PRESIDENT GEORGE W. RICHARDS, D.D.
Lancaster Theological Seminary.

Opening Address—"The Integration of Religion and Education".....PROFESSOR GEORGE B. STEWART, D.D.
Auburn Theological Seminary.

Preliminary Report of the Committee on Co-Operative Research.....PROFESSOR WM. ADAMS BROWN, D.D.
Union Theological Seminary.

Announcement of Group Conferences.

Wednesday, June 27, 9:00 a. m.

Devotional Service.....DEAN L. H. LARIMER, D.D.
Hamma Divinity School.

Address—"The Function of the Theological Seminary"
DEAN D. L. RITCHIE, D.D.
United Theological Colleges, Montreal.

Discussion.....PROFESSOR JEROME DAVIS, D.D.
Yale Divinity School.

Devotional Service, 2:30 p. m.,
PROFESSOR FRED G. HOLLOWAY, B.D.
Westminster Theological Seminary.

Group Conferences—"New Testament"
PROFESSOR KIRSOPP LAKE, D.D.
Harvard Theological School.

"Practical Theology".....PRESIDENT OZORA S. DAVIS, D.D.
Chicago Theological Seminary.

Devotional Service, 8:00 p. m.,
PRINCIPAL ALFRED GANDIER, D.D.
Union Theological College, Toronto.

Address—"The Theology of Crisis"
DEAN ALBERT C. KNUDSON, D.D.
Boston University School of Theology.

Discussion.

Thursday, June 28, 9:30 a. m.

Devotional Service.....PROFESSOR W. F. WUNSCH, D.D.
New Church Theological School.

Address—"Correlation of College and Seminary Courses,"
PRESIDENT FRED C. EISELEN, D.D.
Garrett Biblical Institute.

Report of Group Conferences.

Discussion.

In the absence of President Eiselen, Dr. Theodore F. Herman read his paper.

The Conference was called to order by President George B. Stewart.

The President appointed the following nominating committee; Alfred Gandier, Spencer B. Meeser, W. F. Tillett, H. C. Alleman, and Edward S. Worcester. At the opening of the next session the committee presented nominations as follows: For President, Luther A. Weigle; Vice President, Gerald B. Smith; Secretary-Treasurer, George W. Richards; Corresponding Secretary, W. A. Korn. This report was adopted and the Secretary cast the ballot in favor of the persons placed in nomination.

Report of the Treasurer

The report covers the period from July 1, 1926, to June 21, 1928:

Receipts:

Balance on hand at the last biennial conference	\$654.87
Dues from Berkeley Divinity School (July 1, 1926)	10.00
Received (July 12, 1926) from the Institute of Social and Religious Research	248.78
Dues from 52 Seminaries—February 17, 1927, to May 12, 1927	520.00
Received (May 19, 1927) from the Institute of Social and Religious Research	951.22
Dues from 52 Seminaries—March 10, 1928, to June 21, 1928	520.00
	\$2,904.87

Expenditures:

Expenses for speakers at the last Biennial Conference	\$137.26
55 subscriptions to "Christian Education Printing 500 Bulletins of the Fifth Biennial Conference, and distribution to Seminaries	41.25
Expenses of Secretary at New Haven Conference	127.90
Expenses of Executive Committee meetings and Secretary expenses	31.76
George B. Stewart, expenses of Preliminary survey	249.44
George B. Stewart, expenses as delegate to Hartford Seminary Celebration	984.60
Expenses of Committee on Preliminary Survey	50.66
53 subscriptions to "Christian Education"	19.59
Postage	39.75
	12.00
	\$1,694.21
Balance in the Treasury	1,210.66
	\$2,904.87

Upon recommendation of the Executive Committee The Presbyterian Theological Seminary at Omaha, Nebraska, and The Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, Pa., were elected to membership in the Conference.

The President appointed the Business and Findings Committee as follows: J. R. Stevenson, Alfred Gandier, L. S. Mc-

Colleston, E. C. Lane, Henry Schaeffer, F. N. Parker, George Stibitz, W. H. P. Hatch, C. R. Bowen, W. N. Schwarze, C. T. Craig, B. R. Lacy, Jr., G. W. Richards.

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS AND FINDINGS

The Committee on Business and Findings recommends the adoption of the following:

1. The Conference of Theological Seminaries would express to Union Theological Seminary, and to its President, Henry Sloane Coffin, its deep appreciation of the hospitality which has been extended to us in this sixth biennial meeting. Much has been added to the pleasure of the gathering by the conveniences provided for us, and the courtesies offered.

2. We have heard with great interest the report of progress from the Committee on Co-operative Research, by its chairman, Dr. W. A. Brown. We express our appreciation of the earnest and persistent study which has been given to this matter, and especially are we grateful to Dr. G. B. Stewart for the time and wise leadership which he has so freely given in the preliminary survey.

We request that the main part of Dr. Brown's report should be published as soon as possible, so that all the members of this Conference may be informed as to the steps that have been taken and the outlook for the future.

We have heard with joy of the willingness of the Institute of Social and Religious Research to finance our proposed study of Theological Seminaries as soon as a satisfactory plan shall have been approved by the Executive Committee. We express to them our sincere gratitude for help in what we believe to be an undertaking of the utmost importance for the future development of theological education and pledge our hearty co-operation in this study. We entrust to the Continuation and Executive Committees the making of detailed plans for this work and the selection of a secretary or secretaries who shall carry out the study proposed. But we should like to record here our conviction that it will add greatly to the value of this study and of the results if the services of Dr. W. A. Brown could be secured to exercise a general supervision over the whole work. Dr. Brown's thorough knowledge of the Seminaries, the confidence reposed in him by all groups and classes, his wise and judicial temperament, combine to make him an ideal man for such a place.

3. The papers which have been read at this Conference have been of great interest and value. We, therefore, request and authorize the Secretary-Treasurer to publish in full at the expense of the Conference these papers together with the proceedings of this Conference, and to distribute the same to the various institutions.

4. We are much indebted to our efficient Secretary-Treasurer, President G. W. Richards, for the preparation of the program for this meeting as well as for the way in which he serves as a connecting link in all the activities of the Conference. We suggest that for the program of the next meeting we should continue the group conference idea, which has worked out so profitably at this session, perhaps including surveys of recent German and French literature on important topics. We suggest also the giving of an evening session to a single theological paper, as has been our custom. We hope that by the time of the next meeting the proposed study of theological seminaries will have progressed so far that some of its findings as to the methods and functions of our work may be made the basis of report and discussion.

5. We designate the following persons as members of the Continuation Committee:

CONTINUATION COMMITTEE

Prof. John W. Beardsley,
Theological Seminary, New Brunswick, N. J.
Prof. Wm. Adams Brown,
Union Theological Seminary, New York City.
Prof. John W. Buckham,
Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Cal.
Pres. Ozora S. Davis,
Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.
Prof. Winfred N. Donovan,
The Newton Theological Institution, Newton Centre, Mass.
Pres. F. C. Eiselen,
Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.
Pres. Milton G. Evans,
Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa.
Dean H. E. W. Fosbroke,
General Theological Seminary, New York City.
Prin. D. J. Fraser,
Presbyterian College, Montreal, Que.
Pres. L. F. Gruber,
Lutheran Theological Seminary, Maywood, Ill.
Prof. A. A. Hays,
McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.
Pres. Charles M. Jacobs,
Lutheran Theological Seminary, Mt. Airy, Philadelphia.
Dean A. C. Knudson,
Boston University School of Theology, Boston, Mass.
Pres. Benjamin R. Lacy, Jr.,
Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va.
Dean W. P. Ladd,
Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Conn.
Prof. Kirsopp Lake,
Harvard Theological School, Cambridge, Mass.

Pres. W. D. Mackenzie,
 Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn.
 Dean Shailer Mathews,
 Divinity School, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 Dean Lee S. McCollester,
 Crane Theological School, Tufts College, Mass.
 Pres. E. Y. Mullins,
 Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.
 Pres. G. W. Richards, Theological Seminary, Lancaster, Pa.
 Dean D. L. Ritchie,
 The United Theological College, Montreal, Canada.
 Pres. W. N. Schwarze,
 Moravian College and Theological Seminary, Bethlehem, Pa.
 Pres. J. R. Stevenson,
 The Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J.
 Prof. George B. Stewart,
 Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.
 Prof. W. F. Tillett,
 Vanderbilt School of Religion, Nashville, Tenn.
 Pres. E. S. Tipple, Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.
 Dean Henry B. Washburn,
 Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass.
 Dean L. A. Weigle, Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.
 Pres. W. W. White,
 Biblical Seminary in New York, New York City.
 Prof. Alfred Gandier,
 Union Theological College and Victoria University
 Faculty of Theology, Toronto, Canada.

The *Executive Committee* consists of the President, Dean Luther A. Weigle, the Vice President, Gerald B. Smith, Secretary-Treasurer, G. W. Richards, Wm. Adams Brown, F. C. Eiselen, H. E. W. Fosbroke, C. M. Jacobs, Kirsopp Lake, W. D. Mackenzie, J. R. Stevenson, and E. S. Tipple.

REPORT OF NEW TESTAMENT GROUP CONFERENCE

PROFESSOR KIRSOPP LAKE

In the unexpected absence of Professor Bacon I was obliged to improvise some introductory remarks to what proved to be an interesting and remarkably unanimous meeting.

The question which was raised and discussed with some variations throughout the afternoon, was the change noticeable in the spirit of candidates for the ministry towards the New Testament and the necessary readjustment of the curriculum.

It was agreed, with surprisingly little dissent, that the old-fashioned lecture course on "Introduction" is not tolerated and that with the increasing claim of other subjects, cannot be profitably given.

There was a long discussion as to various alternative ways of dealing with the New Testament as a series of problems in ethics, philosophy, and psychology, introducing such a modicum of "Introduction" as is necessary when occasion demands. Apparently it was not doubted that this can be done, and that it is the most desirable method of teaching future ministers.

But Professor Moulton and others agreed that on these lines it would be impossible to train up teachers of the New Testament and a serious situation would arise if the seminaries had in the future always to go outside the seminaries and largely to rely on Canada, Scotland, England and on the Continent to provide technical scholarship on the New Testament.

REPORT OF THE GROUP CONFERENCE ON PRACTICAL THEOLOGY

D. L. RITCHIE

The Conference on Practical Theology was not only interesting and lively, but fruitful. It cannot but yield good results.

Throughout the afternoon, and the Conference did not adjourn until five o'clock, the attendance varied from fifteen to twenty.

The method of procedure at once proved helpful. The chairman called on the representatives of various schools to describe how the work was done by them in their own schools. The contributions were at once varied and suggestive and led to many questions and other contributions. Homiletics and Pastoral Theology both claimed attention, but the Conference afterwards focussed on that aspect of Pastoral Theology that deals with General Leadership, and how to learn by doing supplemented by teaching instead of through teaching that was afterwards to issue in practice. The experiment that is being tried out at Union Seminary with fifty students was

vividly described by Professor Elliott and many useful questions were asked and helpfully answered.

The main findings of the Conference may be stated thus:

1. It is clear that in all colleges represented the drift of training is from the *a priori* to the empirical method.
2. It is important that the established results of modern psychology and pedagogy should be used in every department of Practical Theology.
3. In Pastoral Theology gain may be had from the wise use of mental therapy by calling to our help men especially trained in that department.
4. That local churches must come to the help of the Seminaries in providing opportunities for the practical training of students and if possible with financial help also.
5. That practice and theory must go together and that the method of learning by doing supplemented by instruction rather than through instruction to be afterwards expressed in doing is worthy of attention.
6. That in view of the increasing complexity of the modern social order the whole subject of Practical Theology calls for thorough study and diligent and careful experiment.

Professor W. A. Brown reported that as a member of a Committee of Theological Professors appointed by the Stockholm Conference he was forwarding to each of the Theological Seminaries in the United States and Canada a letter by Prof. Adolf Deissmann, on behalf of the Committee. He moved that a copy of this letter be referred to the Executive Committee of the Conference to consider what, if any, concerted action was possible along the lines suggested by the letter:

ACTION ON EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

Professor Brown, of the Committee on Co-operative Research reported that the Institute of Social and Religious Research will grant the necessary financial aid for the Survey as soon as the Sub-committee of five provides a plan.

Voted: That we commend the report of Dr. Brown and that the Executive Committee be authorized to use such amount from the treasury of the Conference as may be necessary for the preliminary study of the seminaries.

Voted: That the Conference express its appreciation of the favorable action of The Institute of Social and Religious Research, and that, as evidence of its faith in the enterprise, appropriates necessary funds from its treasury to further this work.

Voted: That the Secretary send greetings to President MacKenzie, who is not able to be present at the meetings.

Galen M. Fisher, Executive Secretary of the Institute of Social and Religious Research has sent the following under date of September 18, 1928, to the General Secretary of the Conference.

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS RESEARCH

370 Seventh Avenue

New York City

September 18, 1928.

The Executive Committee of the Institute of Social and Religious Research, at a meeting held on September 17, 1928, appropriated a sum not to exceed \$7,500, for an Experimental study of Theological Education along the lines stated in "The Proposal" which was distributed on July 22 last, to the conferees of March 2, 1928.

The Experimental Study is to be directed by a Committee consisting of Professor Robert J. Leonard, Chairman; Professor Wm. Adams Brown and Professor Arthur E. Holt, who will present to this Institute, before January 1, 1929, a revised plan for the possible continuation of the Study.

The Study will be under the auspices of the Conference of Theological Seminaries in co-operation with the Institute of Social and Religious Research. The administration of the appropriation and conferences between the Committee and the staff of the Institute will follow the usual Institute procedures.

TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT BIENNIAL CONFERENCE

Dean Shailer Mathews, of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, and President Ozora S. Davis, of the Chicago Theological Seminary, cordially invite the Conference to hold its next Biennial Meeting in Chicago, as the guests of their institutions. The Conference unanimously accepted this invitation; the meeting to be in June, 1930. The days of meeting will be announced in due time.

INSTITUTIONS AND THEIR REPRESENTATIVES AT THE CONFERENCE

Anderson Bible School, Anderson, Ind.

Dean Russell Olt.

Dr. Russell Byrum.

Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.

President Emeritus, George B. Stewart.

Bangor Theological Seminary, Bangor, Me.

Pres. Warren J. Moulton.

Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Conn.

Dean W. P. Ladd.

Biblical Seminary in New York, New York City.

Pres. W. W. White.
 Prof. Walter Bochman.
 Prof. Howard P. Kuist.
 Prof. Carl F. Barackman.
 Boston University School of Theology, Boston, Mass.
 Dean A. C. Knudson.
 Candler School of Theology, Emory University, Ga.
 Dean Franklin N. Parker.
 Central Theological Seminary, Dayton, Ohio.
 Prof. George Stibitz.
 Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.
 Dean Frank G. Ward.
 Crane Theological School, Tufts College, Mass.
 Dean L. S. McCollester.
 Prof. J. A. C. F. Auer.
 Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa.
 Pres. M. G. Evans.
 Prof. S. B. Meeser.
 Prof. M. S. Enslin.
 Divinity School of the Protestant Epis. Church, Phila., Pa.
 Rev. Addison A. Ewing.
 Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.
 Prof. J. Newton Davies.
 Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass.
 Prof. William H. P. Hatch.
 General Theological Seminary, New York City.
 Prof. Thomas S. Cline.
 Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio.
 Dean L. H. Larimer.
 Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn.
 Prof. Charles S. Thayer.
 Prof. Elbert C. Lane.
 Dean Karl R. Stoltz.
 Harvard Theological School, Cambridge, Mass.
 Prof. Kirsopp Lake.
 Lutheran Theological Seminary, Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Prof. E. E. Fischer.
 Prof. John C. Seegers.
 Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.
 Pres. John Aberly.
 Prof. H. C. Alleman.
 Rev. R. T. Stamm.
 Lutheran Theological Seminary, Maywood, Ill.
 Pres. L. Franklin Gruber.
 Prof. Henry Schaeffer.
 McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.
 Prof. A. A. Hays.
 Meadville Theo. School, 5659 Woodlawn, Ave., Chicago, Ill.
 Pres. Clayton R. Bowen.

- Moravian College and Theological Seminary, Bethlehem, Pa.
 Pres. W. N. Schwarze.
 Prof. W. V. Moses.
- New Church Theological Seminary, Cambridge, Mass.
 Prof. William F. Wunsch.
- Newton Theological Institution, Newton Centre, Mass.
 Prof. Winfred N. Donovan.
- Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin, Ohio.
 Prof. Clarence T. Craig.
- Rochester Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.
 Prof. Conrad H. Moehlman.
 Prof. Earnest W. Parsons.
- Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J.
 Pres. J. R. Stevenson.
 Prof. F. W. Loetscher.
- Theological Seminary, New Brunswick, N. J.
 Prof. Edward S. Worcester.
 Prof. Louis H. Holden.
 Prof. Theodore F. Bayles.
- Theological Seminary, Lancaster, Pa.
 Pres. George W. Richards.
 Prof. Theodore F. Herman.
 Sec. William A. Korn.
- Union Theological Seminary, New York City.
 Pres. Henry S. Coffin.
 Prof. W. Adams Brown.
 Prof. H. S. Elliott.
 Prof. Gaylord White.
- Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va.
 Pres. Benjamin R. Lacy, Jr.
- United Theological College, Montreal, Canada.
 Dean D. L. Ritchie.
- Union Theological College and Victoria University Faculty of
 Theology, Toronto, Canada.
 Prof. Alfred Gandier.
- University of Chicago, Divinity School, Chicago, Ill.
 Prof. Gerald B. Smith.
- Vanderbilt School of Religion, Nashville, Tenn.
 Prof. W. F. Tillet.
 Prof. O. E. Brown.
- Westminster Theological Seminary, Westminster, Md.
 Prof. Fred G. Holloway.
- Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.
 Dean Luther A. Weigle.
 Prof. Jerome Davis.
 Prof. Halford E. Luccock.

CONFERENCE MEMBERSHIP

Anderson Bible School, Anderson, Ind., President, J. A. Morrison.

Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y., President
 Harry L. Reed.
 Bangor Theological Seminary, Bangor, Me., President W. J.
 Moulton.
 Biblical Seminary in New York, New York City, President
 Wilbur W. White.
 Bethany Bible School, 3435 Van Buren St., Chicago, Ill.
 Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Conn., Dean W. P.
 Ladd.
 Bonebrake Theological Seminary, Dayton, Ohio, President A.
 T. Howard.
 Boston University School of Theology, Boston, Mass., Dean A.
 C. Knudson.
 Candler Theological Seminary, Emory University, Atlanta,
 Ga., Dean Franklin N. Parker.
 Central Theological Seminary, Dayton, Ohio, President Henry
 J. Christman.
 Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill., President Ozora
 S. Davis.
 Colgate Theological Seminary, Hamilton, N. Y.
 College of Missions, Indianapolis, Ind.
 Crane Theological School, Tufts College, Mass., Dean Lee S.
 McCollester.
 Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa., President Milton
 G. Evans.
 Diocesan Theological College, Montreal, Canada, Principal E.
 I. Rexford.
 Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Phila-
 delphia, Pa.
 Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J., President E. S.
 Tipple.
 Duke University, School of Religion, Durham, N. C., Dean E.
 D. Soper.
 Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass., Dean H. B.
 Washburn.
 Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill., President F. C. Eise-
 len.
 General Theological Seminary, New York City, Dean H. E. W.
 Fosbroke.
 Hama Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio, Dean L. H. Lari-
 mer.
 Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn., President
 W. D. Mackenzie.
 Harvard Theological School, Cambridge, Mass., Dean W. L.
 Sperry.
 Lutheran Theological Seminary, Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.,
 President C. M. Jacobs.
 Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., President
 John Aberly.

Lutheran Theological Seminary, Maywood, Ill., President L. Franklin Gruber.
 McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill., President John T. Stone.
 McMaster University, Toronto, Canada, Chancellor H. P. Whidden.
 Meadville Theological School, Chicago, Ill., President Clayton R. Bowen.
 Moravian College and Theological Seminary, Bethlehem, Pa., President W. N. Schwarze.
 New Church Theological Seminary, Boston, Mass.
 Newton Theological Institution, Newton Centre, Mass., Prof. W. N. Donovan.
 Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin, Ohio.
 Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Cal., Prof. John W. Buckingham.
 Pacific Unitarian School for the Ministry, Berkeley, Cal.
 Presbyterian College of Montreal, Canada, Prof. Charles Bieler.
 Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Omaha, Neb., President Larimore C. Denise.
 Rochester Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y., President C. A. Barbour.
 Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky., President A. T. Robertson.
 Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J., President J. R. Stevenson.
 Theological Seminary, New Brunswick, N. J., Prof. E. S. Worcester.
 Theological Seminary, Lancaster, Pa., President G. W. Richards.
 Trinity College, Toronto, Canada.
 Trinity College, Montreal, Canada.
 Union Theological Seminary, New York City, President Henry S. Coffin.
 Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va., President B. R. Lacy, Jr.
 United Theological College, Montreal, Canada, Dean D. L. Ritchie.
 United Church Theological College, Halifax, N. S.
 Union Theological College and Victoria University Faculty of Theology, Toronto, Canada, Prof. Alfred Gandier.
 University of Chicago, Divinity School, Chicago, Ill., Dean Shailer Mathews.
 Vanderbilt University, School of Religion, Nashville, Tenn., Professor W. F. Tillett.
 Western Theological Seminary, Holland, Mich.
 Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pa., President James A. Kelso.

Westminster Theological Seminary, Westminster, Md., President H. L. Elderdice.
Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Conn., Dean Luther A. Weigle.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON A STUDY OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

BY PROFESSOR WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN

To the Members of the
Conference of Theological Seminaries:

As Chairman of the Committee authorized by the Executive Committee of the Conference of Theological Seminaries to represent the Conference in its negotiations with the Institute of Social and Religious Research, I desire to submit the following preliminary report.

It will be recalled that at the meeting of the Executive Committee on December 31, 1926, Dr. George Black Stewart was requested to confer with representative seminaries and members of church boards as to their attitude toward the proposed study. An appropriation was made for this purpose by the Conference and Dr. Stewart submitted the results of the study to the Executive Committee at a meeting on May 7, 1927.

A committee of three, consisting of Dr. Luther A. Weigle, Dr. George Black Stewart and Dr. William Adams Brown was appointed on the basis of this report to submit a formal proposal to the Institute. This was done on June 24, 1927.

After many discussions and modifications, none of which affected the principles involved, the plan thus prepared was submitted by the Institute to a special committee of educators which met in New York on March 2, 1928. After further revision, as a result of their criticism, it was presented to the Board of Directors of the Institute with an accompanying letter from your chairman on June 26, 1928.

On June 27, 1928, the Institute set aside a reserve from which it would appropriate funds as soon as a satisfactory plan for the study should have been developed. This action by the Board was reported to the Conference on June 28, 1928. On September 17 the Institute authorized an appropriation of \$7,500 from this reserve to cover the cost of developing the plan, the work to be done within four months under the direction of a committee of three, namely, Dr. Robert J. Leonard, Director of the School of Education of Teachers' College, Dr. Arthur E. Holt, Professor of Social Ethics in the Chicago Theological Seminary, and Dr. William Adams Brown, Professor of Systematic Theology in the Union Theological Seminary, in co-operation with the staff of the Institute.

November 1, 1928.

To the Members of the
Conference of Theological Seminaries:

All of these gentlemen have accepted the appointment and after meeting with the representatives of the Institute have organized and adopted a budget and plan of procedure.

This plan contemplates early visits by some member of the Committee to as many as possible of the co-operating seminaries. As it may take some time before these visits can be completed, I will here summarize the proposed plan in its present incomplete shape with certain explanatory comments.

The plan contemplates a triple study:

- (a) A PERSONNEL STUDY.
- (b) AN AREAL STUDY.
- (c) A STUDY OF THE SEMINARIES THEMSELVES.

(a) *The personnel study.*

The general purpose of the personnel study is to determine the kind and character of positions which seminary graduates enter and the problems they meet in their work, in the hope of shedding light upon the questions which the seminaries face in shaping the curriculum and in advising the students as to the best way to make use of it.

(b) *The areal study.*

While the personnel study deals with individuals, particularly seminary graduates, the areal study is concerned with ascertaining in several representative areas, both rural and urban, what training all the resident ministers have had and also their tenure of service, their salaries, and their side occupations, etc. In the same areas an effort would also be made to learn what type of workers seem to survive best under various conditions. The purpose of all this information would be to learn how far our present systems of seminary preparation are meeting the requirements of different conditions and how many of the workers have been trained apart from the seminaries.

(c) *The seminary study.*

This would be a descriptive and evaluative study of the present organization, equipment and work of the seminaries. It would aim not only to record the methods which are actually being followed, but to express the best judgment of the men in the seminaries as to possible methods of improvement in the light of the evidence gained through the personnel and areal studies already referred to.

While these three studies are logically separable, it is obvious that in fact they would largely overlap. They would represent, rather, angles of approach and possible methods of comparison, and would be carried on simultaneously and very often through the same series of workers.

It is sufficient to say of the plan thus outlined that it is the result of a long period of discussion and conference. During the first period, namely, before 1927, it was discussed by the seminaries themselves; since then it has had the consideration of representatives of the seminaries in conference with the Institute and other educators. In the course of these discussions various differences of opinion have arisen, centering chiefly in the relative emphasis which ought to be given to the various features of the plan. The present proposal represents a consensus of judgment reached after such full discussion. While it is open for modification in any way that experience may suggest, it is believed that it will be found to furnish a basis for a study that will really yield new and significant results.

Yours very sincerely,

WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN,
Chairman Committee on Presentation.

THE INTEGRATING OF RELIGION AND EDUCATION.

PROFESSOR GEORGE B. STEWART,
Auburn Theological Seminary.

Dr. Jacks, in *The Hibbert Journal*, a few years ago, told of an Irishman who was cutting peat in the wilds of Connamara, who, on being asked by an English gentleman the way to Letterfrack, took his inquirer to the top of a hill and pointed out the way. He then added: "It is a wretched country to find your way in, Sorr, but a gentleman with a face like yours can't miss the road, though if it were meself that was going to Letterfrack I would not start from here."

As I address myself to finding a way through the wretched, chaotic country in which religion and education are compelled to dwell at present the attempt to reach some sort of destination through it is almost hopeless when one is compelled to start from the present relations between them. Yet we must start from the point, or, rather, situation, in which we find these two vastly important factors in our social order.

Both religion and education create the impression that they have lost their way. One only needs a cursory knowledge of the books, magazines, and public utterances from Pulpit, convention platforms and class-rooms to realize that they have mutual hostility to each other, and to fear that they are hoping for a permanent and absolute divorce on the ground of incompatibility.

The Colleges and Education are reported to have received last year one hundred and eighty-seven million dollars, and the churches and religion one million. This ratio of 187 to 1 doubtless fairly represents the relative evaluation by the average citizen of education and religion.

The relative favor of the two with serious-minded folk is arresting. Our colleges and universities are crowded to the doors, and clamoring entrants on the outside are told "Not even standing room." While our churches are empty, or filled, if filled, through some non-religious attraction, such as, a "gorgeous pageant," "magnificent music," "striking brilliance of thought and eloquence of utterance," or "delightful social hour," or "chicken and waffle supper following." This contrast in their relative appealing power may be easily explained and possibly justified, nevertheless it is suggestive of a lack of unity and co-ordination of religion and education as they lie in the minds of thoughtful Americans.

If we pursue our observation further, we are struck by the indifference of educators and the educated class, so to speak, toward religion, as a sphere of life in which they have slight or no interest, on the one hand, and on the other, by the apprehension of religious leaders that education is sapping the foundations of cherished faiths and must be vigorously com-

batted. Illustrations, may be found in the recent dedication of a superbly beautiful chapel at a great university where there is an urgent demand for voluntary chapel, a demand which has been partially met with the result that out of 2,000 students there is an attendance of scarcely two score. A President of a large university with a numerous Faculty deplored the almost total absence of interest of his professors in religion. The Dayton Trial, and the line-up which it produced through our churches, and the Fundamentalist controversy now agitating the church in controversy that is both divisive and intolerant of independent thinking and speech are in point. These and many kindred facts illustrate the present divergence of religion and education in spirit and behaviour.

This is a generalized statement of the existing relations between Religion and Education, and like all generalizations is not accurate as to every detail. There are many gratifying exceptions. But for them we who are working in both the field of religion and of education would lose heart. We, however, believe that this present attitude of each toward the other will not result ultimately in a decree of absolute divorce. To prevent this issue, we must seek out their common interests. Both religious leaders and educators must be made to see that united they stand and divided they fall. Antagonism is fatal to both. It is imperative for the highest interests of both that the bonds of union be strengthened beyond any possibility of breaking. Indeed, it is greatly to be desired that the two interests should be so harmonized that they interpenetrate, blend, become an integer. We believe it is possible thus to integrate these potent forces, adding to each the huge potentialities of the other.

The Roman Church has a clearly defined plan for accomplishing this and the results justify its faith in its scheme and in its methods for putting it across. While we do not approve either of its program or of its procedure, we cannot fail to commend its vision and appraisal of values in adjusting religion and education to each other.

The Protestant churches are almost wholly destitute of program, and of procedure there is distressing confusion and ineffectiveness. We, in fact, seem in some vital respects to be visionless and incapable of rational evaluation.

There is a revival of religious education as a parish or community activity in the interests of the youth. This is a hopeful feature, but this phase of religious education has a long and perilous road to travel before a worth-while destination is reached.

The history of the religious training of children and youth in this country is a history of the home as a school of religious instruction. A most efficient school it was. The parents had

a definite body of truth for material. They were able to command the attention and diligence of their children. They had a clear vision of their objectives. The result was that the children entered mature life with a working knowledge of the Bible, of Christian doctrine, of Christian morality. All the outcome of this method of religious training may not have been wholly beneficial, but it was education in the sphere of religion and was religion functioning in the sphere of education, both religion and education co-operating whole-heartedly and effectively toward a common end. There was no conflict, no independence. There was sympathetic interdependence.

In my boyhood home I was required to commit the four Gospels to memory; also the Book of the Psalms, many of the Proverbs, many passages in the Old and New Testaments, the questions and answers in the Catechism, and many of the hymns in the hymn book of the Church. It was not a holiday performance, but was serious business, accompanied by real tests for satisfactory results. While it was not to my liking at the time, yet, as an Irishman might say: "It felt so good after it got done hurting."

Some of us have vivid memories of this School of Religious Education. This School has closed its doors, having become bankrupt in interested and competent teachers, methods, objectives, and, to a large degree, opportunity.

The Church supplemented the home with the Sunday-school, which to an increasing extent became a substitute for the home, a poor substitute in method, spirit, and resultfulness.

The inadequacy of the Sunday-school became so conspicuous that the Daily Vacation Bible School, the Week-day religious instruction, and the Community Religious School have been introduced, in an attempt to make good the deficiency. The attempt is so partial in its endeavor, on the number reached, in the results attained, as to be worthy of but little commendation beyond that given to a serious and honest effort on the part of a limited number of pioneers.

From the religious point of view the education of our children and youth is in a deplorable condition. This condition is somewhat relieved by the pronounced and encouraging tendency among those in the church who are addressing themselves to the problems here existing, to place the religious education of the children on the best pedagogical basis. They are aiming to make religious instruction worthy to rank with secular instruction. Not a high standard of excellence and one that is constantly shifting because of the persistent experimentation in methods and aims in secular education. Our secular schools formerly were museums. They are now laboratories. They were standardized. Now they are shifting continually. The children then were led along well constructed highways, at times arid and dreary, but always making for a

destination. Now they wander through the fields of knowledge, gathering such flowers as their whim lures them to, but arriving, except by accident, at no destination.

This confusion and inefficiency of our secular school system, since it is the best we have for the guidance of our religious educators, constitute added elements of difficulty and inefficiency for the latter.

When we pass to the consideration of religious education on the higher levels, such as, the preparation of men for the ministry and of men and women for leadership in various church activities, we find some of the problems referred to, and many new ones. The church has in most of its branches insisted upon a educated ministry, and until recent years the education of ministers has been fairly well standardized. The theological seminaries were in a general way organized for the teaching of the same curriculum by the same methods under the inspiration of the same formative ideals. Their product was expected to enter upon the same forms of activity and be ready for the discharge of the same duties. Their product, on the whole, was well-prepared for the minister's task of yesterday.

This group of ours which is engaged in theological seminary work need not be advised of the radical changes which have taken place in this field. Many of the seminaries have yielded to the demands for change and have modified their curriculum, their methods and their goals. Others have made but slight changes, if any, and these only under pressure and not sympathetically, but grudgingly. Those which have made the most radical changes have merely incorporated them into the old established order. The result is that the curriculum, the material, the informing purpose, hitherto fairly standardized, have become so diverse and diversified, that it is difficult in the transfer of a student from one seminary to another to make satisfactorily the necessary articulations.

An even worse result has followed. The new which has been introduced into the old lacks *vital connection* with it. So to speak, it has been tied to the old trunk, and not grafted into the tree. Seminary administrators are almost driven to despair in effort to make peaceful and harmonious adjustments between the clamorous New and the resisting and obstinate Old. Faculty, curriculum, schedule, calendar, and ecclesiastical bodies conspire against change.

We are all sensible of the confusion and chaos. Happily it is confusion and chaos born of life and growth. The seminaries are not as dead as some would have us think. The present condition, which is far from satisfactory, is prophetic of better things, which will be realized in our schools becoming fitter instruments in our hands for our high purposes than they now are, if we have the courage and wisdom to carry

forward the transformation. Briefly stated, the Old Seminary must be re-built from the ground up if it is to supply to the church the ministerial leadership that the church must have. The time for enrichment of our seminaries has passed. The time for drastic reconstruction has arrived. Let us arise and build.

There is still another phase of higher religious education that we must seriously consider, the training of leaders in church activities. At present we are playing at the job, or lazily lying down on it. The demand for properly qualified men and women for directing our church activities is increasing at a startling rate, startling when we consider how little the church is doing toward meeting it. Not only is the number of instructed leaders utterly inadequate, but their preparation is so defective both in quantity and quality, as to raise the question whether the church would not be as well off without them. Here, as in the training for the ministry we are casual, are opportunists, are on the road, if we are, but do not know where we are going. We have not worked out a program of religious education for our men and women who are to direct our church activities. Where anything at all is being done, we seem to be groping our way in the matters of personal qualifications of the students, in the nature of the tests to be applied to matriculants, in the material of instruction, in the methods to be employed, in the objectives. Even the term "religious education" is so illy conceived that those who believe in the undertaking thus designated and those who are indifferent or hostile to it, do not quite know what they are talking about when they use it. It is clear that we do not all talk the same language.

I am not trying to present a pessimistic view of the situation. On the contrary, my purpose is to inspire us to an understanding of the imperiousness of the problems facing the church in the field of education in religion. The urgency of the problem is not the only feature of it. It has many elements, so interwoven, and I fear, so little understood, as to make the problem appear at times insoluble. Yet we dare not ignore it, nor take the lines of least resistance in the solution. Patience, vision, courage, tact, discrimination, will win here as they win elsewhere.

We are at Connamara and our destination is Letterfrack, and it is a wretched, perplexing, obscure road from one to the other. But we must take this road. There is no other. It is our fond hope that gentlemen in educational and religious groups with the intelligence and devotion we ascribe to our colleagues will find their way to the desired destination.

Some constructive suggestions may properly be requested of one who assumes to criticise. Recognizing the reasonableness of such a request I venture to offer a few suggestions,

which may at least serve the useful purpose of showing what we ought not to do. I offer these suggestions modestly and with due apologies for my presumption.

Bertram Russell, in his stimulating book, "Education and the Good Life," makes this broad, unqualified statement: "Education is the key to the new world." (p. 83.) I would qualify this statement and say with the confidence of a Bertram Russell, "education and religion integrated in a vital union are the key to the new world." This is so radical a modification of his position that we can hardly expect our distinguished author to accept it. But we must. It is at this point we must start our effort at finding our way out of present chaos. We must believe whole-heartedly in religion and education and in their mutual dependence for their highest value and greatest efficiency.

In the same book, our modern philosopher emphasizes that the pupil rather than the material or method of education should be the chief, the sole, objective of the teacher and in this he is incontestably correct. If we are to solve our intricate problem we must aim to make men and women and not to teach subjects. Everything must be subordinated to the interests and needs of the pupil. Mr. Russell says, "The ideal teacher loves his children better than his State or his Church" (P. 57). I would add that in our task the institution and the professor must love the pupil more than the things taught or the method of teaching them. This may be a hard doctrine for some institutions and professors, but it is a fundamental pre-requisite.

I venture three further suggestions, which must be briefly stated without elaboration.

I. The whole man must be included in our religious educational process.

Hitherto, for obvious and measurably justifiable reasons we have concentrated attention and effort on the *Intellectual* preparation for the ministry and lay activity. This may not be neglected nor even lessened, but it must not be our exclusive interest.

The minister and lay-leader must be *Physically* fit. It is not necessary or desirable that he should be an athlete, or even athletic, but he should know how to keep himself in the best physical condition in an occupation that is largely a sedentary one, and that entails special perils particularly in the middle period of life, when he should be at concert pitch physically. He should also be prepared to establish effective contacts with his young people, especially, boys and young men along the line of their sports and other features of their physical life. This involves a curriculum and equipment for the physical training of these men.

The minister and lay-leader must be *Socially* fit. He must

be qualified to enter into the individual, group, church, community social order as a significant and cultivated factor. He must have a real and sympathetic interest in men and women and little children and must know how to get next to them. A large part of life will be spent in mingling with folks. It is essential that he know them, the things they live by, the springs of action within them. It is essential that he have the qualities and the manners that will make him an acceptable and forceful social unit. This involves a curriculum and equipment for the social training of these men.

The minister and lay-leader must be *Spiritually* fit. All of his activity heads up and gets its keenest significance in the things of the spirit, his spirit, the spirit of his people, the Spirit of God. If he is not committed utterly to these, then why is he in his high office at all? Everything else makes its contribution or its subtraction here. I am not thinking in terms of mysticism, although we must all be something of mystics, if we are to fulfill the whole of our office as ministers and leaders. I am thinking in terms of the whole moral and spiritual life, thinking of the cultivation of the graces of the spirit, of the correct evaluation of spiritual realities, of the setting up of spiritual standards for conduct. The remark of the pious mother, "John has gone to the theological seminary, I hope when he comes out he will still be a Christian," should never be thought of as other than a crude and wholly unjustifiable comment on the seminary or the school for laymen. These institutions should put a heavy emphasis upon the spiritual preparation of their students.

Each of these four phases of training, the intellectual, the physical, the social, the spiritual, requires its own special scheme and method and physical equipment and personnel. Religious education to be adequate must provide for this symmetrical culture of the whole man.

II. The whole task must be made the goal of our religious educational process.

The minister's task until recent days was comparatively uniform everywhere and composed of simple and understandable elements. Such a phrase as "Job analysis" had no place in our vocabulary. Now there is so wide a variety of features in the minister's work and those of his associates in church activities that specialization, and high specialization for many churches and communities, is imperative. The job must be analyzed and the specially qualified man and woman must be assigned to it.

This lays upon the seminaries and the schools for lay-leaders a new and puzzling responsibility, which they dare not shirk and for which they must prepare themselves in a liberal and sympathetic way.

III. The whole field of religious educational interests must be covered in the organization of the institutions.

The diverse and multiplied duties of the minister and his associates to which my last suggestion applied bring to view the wide range of subjects which a sufficient curriculum of religious education is required to embrace. These are so numerous that they need to be grouped into departments.

Of course, the traditional subjects of the theological curriculum should not be omitted, although proportions, methods, ideals will be and should be subject to change.

What is commonly termed religious education includes quite a numerous group of subjects, sufficient to justify a School, or Department or College of religious education.

The same may be said of ecclesiastical fine arts, including church architecture, church music, church decoration, a fascinating group of subjects, now quite neglected on the religious side and consigned to the secular educational agencies, where they are consistently ignored.

The same may be said for religious research, for which an important field stands open challenging the church, in psychoanalysis and other fields of human interests.

The same may be said for religious editorship, for which the religious journal, is not the only avenue of usefulness. There is the now-neglected and sadly needed preparation of religious text-books. The secular schools have greatly developed and vastly improved their text-books and the church has done nothing systematic in this respect or has allowed it to drift into irresponsible and in most cases utterly incompetent hands. A body of religious editors should be the product of some institution.

The mere mentioning of these areas of religious education reveals the aridity of our educational system and the hugeness of the new task awaiting the church in these areas.

Sufficient apology should be made for the sketchiness of this treatment. It was impossible under the conditions to do otherwise. Yet even this hurried and fragmentary presentation may possibly be provocative of a fuller discussion of the importance of interpenetrating education with religion and extending in three dimensions the concern of religion in education.

The results of the divorce of religion and education in France are revealed by a study of a recent census. Out of a population of less than forty millions, nearly thirty millions announced themselves as skeptics, agnostics, infidels or "without religion." History shows that the most disastrous failures have been the result of religion or of education ignoring the other and flattering itself that it can attain its goal by going alone. We know better. This Conference of theological seminaries and colleges has consistently from the beginning

committed itself to the sole and supreme task of marrying religion and education as tight and as fast as is possible for a group of religious men engaged in education.

Education to achieve the highest levels of culture and enlightenment must be genuinely religious, and religion to fulfill its functions and establish on ever-completer foundations the realm of God must be frankly educative and in harmony with the keenest, and most open-minded intellectual life of the age.

THE FUNCTION OF A THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE

DEAN D. L. RITCHIE,

United Theological College, Montreal.

The brethren will pardon the personal note on which this paper opens, but it is the penalty—the grievous penalty—of a short speech made in this city some time ago on my experience in Theological Colleges and in training men for the Christian Ministry. Our Secretary at once requested me to be ready to repeat it at length here—surely a hard and quite unnecessary work of supererogation. If there is anything harder to utter than an old and cold sermon, it must be a cold and an old speech. Did ever a man have a more poignant plea “*ad misericordiam*” than I have to-day?

What I am to say is one man’s experience that has passed into conviction. These convictions have formed themselves almost irresistibly from facts thrusting themselves home. They are the result of experiments, too, seen or tried, some of which failed, some of which succeeded, partially at least, in helping one to do better work. Therein, mayhap, may be found this paper’s only value. It may also be provocative of discussion, for I know that in some things I may be in conflict with some types of educational theory claiming psychological warrant; but that does not move me; in these days anything may masquerade in the name of psychology. After all the proof of the pudding is in the eating and especially in the after effects, and not in the recipe. Not a little educational theory looks excellent on paper, and it ought to work out they say, but it simply does not bring forth good results in a practical world, whatever it may do some day in an ideal one. We must make the best bricks we can, with the clay we have, amid the limitations set us, for the purposes which the Churches have in view. Theological Colleges are usually the institutions of Churches with aims, standards and traditions which they cherish and seek to advance. Not that these Churches are careless of truth, but they want the truth clothed in ways that appeal to them and in forms which they honestly believe make for its preservation. Theological Colleges, after all, are practical work-shops, not halls for speculative theory and every passing educational experiment.

On the other hand, I want to protest against the notion that while everywhere else things move forward, or at least round, theological colleges stand still, the homes of the ancient and quaint, the musty and obscurantist, the dogmatic and unscientific. To hear some people speak you would think that theological Professors have learned nothing and forgotten nothing from the days of Erasmus until now, that they do little but drink of the numbing waters of dogmatism and sleep the deep slumber of the antiquated. That is not my fear for them nowadays, but

rather that they should be the victims of the latest craze and the echo of the theory most loudly trumpeted. The plain truth is, that during the past forty years theological colleges have been transformed, and in many ways, if not always, for the better. While never forgetting that there is a historic faith and a historic church, they, speaking generally, are ready to welcome the march of truth, for their chief business is "to hear the truth and bear the truth and bring the truth to bear on all they are and do," assured that only good can come what'er the course truth take. But the newest is not necessarily the truest; indeed, much of the deepest wisdom in education, as in other things, is very ancient. The merely up-to-date is usually soon out-of-date. And in theology we are beginning to see that our fathers struggled earnestly to get at truth, however clumsily they sometimes may have expressed it. Of course, theological colleges must change or perish, but let them change with the wise caution that becomes them because of the truth they conserve. With courage and with skill let means be adapted to ends, but the pursuit of the fashionable and passing is none of their business. Truth seldom goes on the wings of the changeful wind; clouds do, but the mountains stand fast. Theological Colleges must stand fast in the liberty with which Christ hath set them free, and also be ready to march with truth wherever the spirit of truth leads. They need have no other concern.

What then is their chief business in which they must be found diligent? As I understand it, it is the instruction and training of men (in some Colleges of women, too) for the work of the Christian Ministry. It is the discipline of Christian personalities to make of them teachers, pastors and leaders of Christian fellowships, so that in and through them the will of God may be done on earth as it is in heaven. What we seek is not merely instruction, but the disciplined Christian personality efficiently trained for a specific task. Our immediate and direct business is not to train social reformers, or community engineers, or ecclesiastical mechanics, or managers of a city welfare-plant, how much less maids-of-all-work to serve a parish.

These occupations may be by-products of a Christian minister's central task and valuable functions in themselves, but are they the specific business of a theological college or seminary? I can conceive of schools for training in such and other necessary social work gathering round a theological college for inspiration; but to expect such a college to do all these things is to divert it from its task and to drive it into sheer futility. One of the challenges to theological colleges is to recall ministers to their distinctive work, for the trouble with the Church is not lack of organization or multiplied activities; her weakness is seen in that she is an untaught and

uninspired Church. She is forgetting the secret and practice of worship, and yet for her worship is breathing the tonic air of the hills of God that makes the daily service joyous and effective. She needs more than anything else the strength that comes from the Mount, from being fed on the living word of God—the bread that comes down from Heaven.

Our chief aim must be to give to the Church a teaching and inspiring Ministry. It is the greatest of all tasks, yielding the power that must be behind all other effective social and human ministries. What is most needed to-day, is that our vast and complex ecclesiastical, social and philanthropic machinery should be kept effectively linked to the power-house of faith. "Hitch your wagon to a star," said Emerson; the distinctive thing in Christianity is that it brings the star to the wagon, and it is the chief business of Christian Ministers to teach men so. To put it in another way:—our civilization has tried to mount on wings, for it has many aspirations to fly; but it has come down with a bump, because its spiritual power has run out; its tanks are empty, and it is the business of the Christian Church to fill them and to keep them full, and of ministers to teach the Church how to do it. To me, therefore, the distinctive work of a theological college is simply plain, and it fails the Church and the world when it turns aside to other and easier tasks. Its whole business is to instruct and inspire men to teach others how to live together as the children of God. Other amazing achievements in air and on sea and land in dazzling successions, are daily written down to men's credit, but the secret of living together as brethren still baffles them. And academic sociologies so far have not discovered the secret. That secret is found through the Divine Society, the Christian Church, which maintains theological colleges to train teachers to unfold the secret and to quicken men to put its truth to work in daily life. Such, it seems to me, is pre-eminently our task.

But on the threshold of this high enterprise we are confronted with what is the hardest part of it, the nurture of our students in the admonition of the Lord, the culture of their personalities in the devout life, in a piety objective, sane, bracingly healthy. I have never spoken to a College Principal who was not deeply concerned about that, with some sense of failure in his own method and eagerness to learn if there was a more excellent way. It is the deep sense men have that disciplined personality, needful everywhere, is imperatively necessary in the Christian Ministry. "Take heed to thyself," says the Epistle, before it says anything about the teaching.

How to keep a spiritual atmosphere in Divinity Halls and a tonic air in theological class-rooms is the challenge that comes daily to theological Professors. How, not only to talk learnedly about God, but to deepen the reality of God and fel-

lowship with Him through the Spirit of Christ—aye; there's the rub—the one thing needful without which all other instruction however valuable fails our chief purpose. There sometimes seems to be something in academic life—in its analytic and historical methods, its critical handling of truth, its necessary readjustments and destruction of positions, ideas and prejudices which have built themselves round young religious life, its, mayhap, too easy familiarity with sacred things—that chills the devotional fervour and leaves life drifting without the compass of an intelligent creed, or the rudder of conviction. Many a student who has come to us with a glow of enthusiasm has to fight for his soul's true life in a Divinity Hall. Theological students have the ordinary human temptations and difficulties, for gentlemen in theological seminaries "are not exactly plaster saints," in addition there are those temptations peculiar to their calling and training, and these have their own grim reality. How to make our students more than conquerors through Christ that loved them, and keep them eager with a full measure of devotion in his service, is our abiding problem, for we may take it as a certainty that men do not fail in the ministry for lack of Biblical criticism or correct homiletic method; they fail in the citadel of the soul, where the fires of the faith have burned low or gone out.

Moreover, do we not sometimes make this work all the harder by the academic zeal and intellectual dexterity with which we try to defend the faith? I sometimes think that the faithlessness of the faithful can be nowhere better seen than in some theological class-rooms. But, brethren, as a distinguished teacher in this seminary said:—"Christianity of the Lord Jesus Christ is a fire which He came to kindle. You and I are not like a group of men upon a lonely moor kneeling down to prevent a little spot being blown out by the great winds of the world, although to listen to some people you would think that we were. The Christian Church is not nervously engaged in trying to prevent the extinction of Christianity from the Universe. What you and I have to do is to keep in touch with the fire. The fire will always burn; the question is whether it will burn in our lives, whether it has material to use in our devotion, thought and perseverance that will enable God to do the work of lightening and warming our age. That is the problem for our service, and that is where we are to learn again the great truth that the Christian religion, Christian service, implies a first hand acquaintance with God."

But granted that the Church has been able to send us material of a fair quality, spiritually and intellectually, to be trained for her ministry—surely a part of her chief business—and that the theological colleges have succeeded, in a measure at least, in generating a climate in which young person-

ality can grow and be disciplined to high emprise and the finest issues of Christian living, the question arises—what next?

Most of us, I think, are agreed that the best training for a theological course is found in a sound University Arts' course. It means a seven or an eight years' training—a large slice out of a man's life, but the Christian ministry has a right to the best in men and time, and it ought to aim again at being what it once was—the best educated for its task of all the learned professions, if for a moment I may so class it.

But what mean we by a University Course with the ministry in view? Are we thinking first of subjects or of men, of teaching students or of instruction in curricula? These latter can be important enough in their own place, but they are the second, not the first. In a University, which ought to be much more than a vocational school, manhood broadly-trained, largely quickened, and generously fertilized, must be the aim; the mind behind all examination attainments is what matters, for it is true, lamentably true, that we may have academic attainments without intelligence. A high-brow is a man buried beneath the green wood of learning, but without intelligence to use it or to set it on fire. There are not a few of them about. But it is disciplined intelligence that is required in the ministry,—the power to see and to think, to think keenly, deeply and justly, to judge wisely and to act fearlessly and generously as become leaders of their fellow-men.

It has been well said: "That Universities are schools of education and schools of research. But the primary reason for their existence is not to be found either in the mere knowledge conveyed to the student or in the mere opportunities for research afforded to the Faculty—the justification for a University is that it preserves the connections between knowledge and the zest for life, by uniting young and old in the imaginative consideration of learning. The University imparts information, but it imparts it imaginatively. At least, this is the function which it should perform to society." The use of information to feed, strengthen, and discipline creative imagination in youth—such is the work of a University when it knows its business; such certainly is the training we need for the Christian ministry. Dr. Henry Van Dyke has aptly put it in another way. He has described three ideals in education. First, the "decorative ideal," which regards education as an adornment appended to a man's personal life. Second, the "marketable ideal," which thinks of education as a means of making a living and not making a life. The third and true ideal is the "creative ideal" in which the purpose of education is to create an enlarged capacity for real life, for a larger, freer and finer life. And the third ideal is what we want kept

before students in Arts with hearts set on the Christian ministry.

There are some who would say that given the right aims and climate, it matters little what the subjects of instruction are. But with a measure of truth, that is an example of the fallacy of revolt. Where practised it has produced the freakish in education. We cannot but be grateful that this cafeteria conception of education has passed, or is quickly passing. It stood for little but electives and options; choose what you like, pick up credits where you can, let nutrition care for itself, and live ever afterwards an undisciplined and starved intellectual life. We certainly do not want anything like it in a University course aiming at the Ministry. There are certain prerequisites which, taken in a wise order, build up foundations for a strong theological course, and attempts at substitutes for them always leave something to be desired. Experience has proved that for effective usefulness in the Ministry there is nothing better than a broad training; in language to give accuracy and warmth; in literature to enrich and discipline imagination and give power of expression; in science to train the reason and instruct in intellectual method; in history to give larger and true perspectives, and in philosophy to supply a theory of knowledge and standards of value. Further, too early specialization is to be discouraged. A certain zeal for honours courses, which are not honours courses, or something added to the ordinary basic course, but only early specializing in one or more subjects, has been working harm with promising men. Especially is it so where certain somewhat undetermined and inclusive subjects like sociology, are chosen. Moreover, the keen competition of departments to gather in the best students, increases the harm. It was with hope and pleasure that I heard the Dean of Arts in McGill University declare the other day that the facts proved that the ordinary degree course was producing the best men, and that there was no Arts degree so much worth as an educational badge as a first class in that course. Our experience at the Divinity Hall, Montreal, corroborates his judgment. Let what can be added by way of "honours and specializing" if time can be had, but give us first the broadly-trained rather than the narrowly-trained man. In other words, give us students who have been taught, men who have been disciplined, rather than one or two subjects that have been crammed for so-called honours' degrees. Turrets and pinnacles are safest when they rest on strong foundations.

In all this I am not un-mindful that I am in conflict with certain psychological and educational theories that stress the importance of training along the lines of special interests and choices. Theoretically these tell us what the product should be. It all seems so reasonable, but somehow it does not work

out successfully, and we have to deal with things as they are and with fruits as produced. It may be theoretically all right to let the young colts feed where they choose and career among the lush pastures as they think best, but meanwhile the useful plough stands in the furrow waiting for disciplined and steady power. But usefulness is the rent that everyone must pay for room to live in this world. Pre-eminently so is it true of the Christian Minister.

Recently I read Boyd Barrett's book on the training of a Jesuit. For its purpose what a discipline that is. That purpose we may regard as utterly mistaken, even as vicious—an ugly perversion of human nature and a caricature of Christianity, the central truth of which—the Incarnation—stands among other things for the sacredness of the body and not for its daily torture and degradation. But Loyola knew what he wanted, and in the Jesuit Order set himself to get it through one of the most startling disciplines the world knows. With entirely different aims and purposes, may not Protestantism learn from it how to be efficient in its training of men for the work to be done? That in my judgment means a wisely chosen and carefully built course of training beginning with the University.

After the University comes the vocational school, or Seminary, with its distinctively theological training; and here I would plead for the continuance of the policy and methods that aim at the disciplined man rather than the teaching of subjects. The subjects to be taught hardly need to be chosen; they assert themselves. They are "Biblical Science,"—to use Professor Peake's comprehensive and happily chosen phrase, Ecclesiastical History, Systematic Theology, Practical Theology. However we may build up a Theological Encyclopædia, within each of these departments there is rich variety, but, whatever may be the trimmings these are the material for the garment. Moreover, they follow the type of training already advocated in the University—the languages of two great literatures, at least one of them—New Testament Greek; history with its perspectives and long views; philosophy with its values, its ordered knowledge and its grasp of reality; vocational training with knowledge and discipline turned to usefulness in the practical service of Christ's Church.

It will be readily granted that whatever more a Christian minister may be, he should be expert in the Scriptures and deeply taught in Christian Theology. He ought to know the things he is set to teach and the ways of the human soul to which he is to teach them. Through vital experience of the truth he declares, he must find his way to the heart of others to move them to spiritual levels of life. And there is

no royal road to that, except by being master of the subjects in hand and of the best methods of inspiring men and women by means of them. All of which, doubtless, is common and non-debatable ground with most of us.

But now we may come to matters of controversy. What about Practical Theology? On this side of the Atlantic there is a great demand for it. Its content is constantly being enlarged and the things expected of it multiplied. In nearly all its sections it has also, of late years, become more scientific in its methods. But can the theological college make men experts in all branches of Christian service demanded of the Church by a social order that is yearly becoming more complex? Is it wise to attempt it? Cannot broadly-trained men be trusted to master most of these things through daily experience and the use of a few books? Are we not in our colleges trying to do from without, and in mechanical ways, what can be done only from within by the inspirations and duties of daily life? Is there not too much fuss made about practical training, and time spent on it in College that might well be better given to graver and deeper matters?

Take Homiletics for example. One rejoices that the teaching of Homiletics has taken strides in getting down to psychological facts and truths and to sound pædagogical principles. But here, after all, are we not in danger of becoming the slaves of elaborate and futile technicians? Is not spontaneity the mark of all good preaching? Is not the main thing to have something to say and to say it simply and directly? Is not the clamour about "getting it over" by training in types of psychology and elaborate technique of public speaking a policy to which notional outsiders have driven us? What is the use of elaborately "getting over" nothing? We do not want preachers who like many golfers know all the rules of the game and all the theories professionals teach, but cannot hit a straight ball or even hit a ball at all. What preachers so futile as those that bear all the hall-marks of the seminary and yet get nowhere? With a few sound principles of exegesis and of logical construction and some training in articulation, have we not the sum of the matter? Is not the best training in homiletics got by thoughtfully listening to good preaching? Are not the most useful lectures on homiletics those on the history of preaching or on great preachers? Would it not be a gain to religion in general, and preaching in particular, if theological students were silenced in public until they had something vital to say? Merely "yapping" about religion is not preaching. I confess that I have admiration for the Scots tradition of discouraging students from preaching until their final year in theology, for the more I see of regular week-end preaching (often even by Arts students) and of students trying to be ministers and

theological students at the same time, as so many in Canada try to be, the more convinced I am that it is all wrong and that we are destroying preaching and preachers in the making. In the training for no other profession do they permit the uninstructed amateur to practice. Evidently souls, certainly not bodies, can be presumptuously trifled with.

Of course, I am not unmindful that the elementary schools do the work of teaching the English language so badly, and that even Universities are so careless about it, that in Divinity Halls much time has to be spent on grammar, articulation and pronunciation, nor do I forget that the present necessities of the Churches demand the services of youths if they can talk at all. Moreover, economic stringency requires that they do talk. They educate themselves by far too much premature preaching. But it is getting us nowhere. It will continue, I suppose, until Christians take the Christian Church as seriously as they take motoring and golf. And I say all this after having tried diligently to be a teacher of Systematic Theology and Homiletics for twenty-six years.

There is one aspect of Practical Theology which may require serious attention and adjustment. It is Pastoral Theology. The whole trend and complexity of modern life is making this side of a minister's life increasingly difficult. He used to shepherd families; the rush in our living to-day makes it hard for him to shepherd even single sheep. Even the country minister complains for lack of opportunity to meet with his people quietly and usefully. By the free use of the telephone he tries to keep in touch with them and to show his interest in them, but the deeper side of a pastor's work is becoming well nigh impossible. Social visiting may have its place, but it requires an alert and skilled man to use it for the high office of shepherding the flock. So difficult has the work become that many ministers declare that the greater part of general pastoral visitation is a waste of strength and time. But can the human touch warm and solicitous for the good of another ever be wasted? There is certainly much complaint that pastoral work is falling into abeyance. "We have a preacher, not a minister," say many.

Now it was an axiom with the great Thomas Chalmers that "a house-going preacher makes a church-going people." It used to be so; I wonder if it can be proved that it is so still? One thing is plain to-day, that of all the forms of evangelism now being tried, no one is so fruitful and permanently successful as personal evangelism by ministers and Church members in a given Church area. Human hearts still respond to personal interest and the Divine-human touch. However, the work is to be done, it is plain that there will always be a great place for the diligent pastor of the flock. Nothing else, not even an elaborate office system of cards and filing, however

useful for its own purpose, can take his place. Here, again, are we not in danger of permitting the ecclesiastical mechanics and office technicians to destroy the one thing needful—the interpenetration by one life on the lives of others? What shall it profit a minister if he shall gain elaborate office efficiency and lose the soul of the pastorate? To be a skilled office-manager is one thing; to be a shepherd of God's flock is quite another. And I mean a shepherd and not merely a restless, hustling sheep-dog. May it not be one of the special functions of a theological college to-day to recall ministers from many activities that consume time and strength to the high task of a cure of souls?

It seems to me that this whole field requires much thinking out by those who would guide students. So much of the guidance that met the needs of yesterday is of little avail to-day alike for city and country parishes. Mayhap only by pooling the experience of successful pastors in conferences with students, may the theological college be able to help in any real way. Supervised field work may also bring its own reward. One thing is clear; this challenge of the pastorate offers an open door to the broadly-trained, resourceful, adaptable man; but the whole situation is so complex and so changing that no book axioms or rule-of-thumb methods can be of use. Only widely informed, resourceful men can meet it.

Is it possible that the principles that under-lie the rapidly growing science of mental therapathy may have to be made part of an effective course in Pastoral Theology? I do not mean that pastors should set up as psychiatrists, for that would mean another training not within their reach, but are there no highways of knowledge there, which, carefully taught, would help the pastor to avoid mistakes and render more effective service to troubled souls? Certainly, when I first read Hadfield's "Psychology and Morals," and other sane books on that subject, I wished that when I was a young minister in two heavy pastorates I had known the principles that underlie them. Further, who can but be interested in the skillful use to which the Roman Church is putting Modern Psychology in underpinning her practice of the Confessional, and in making even more effective the practical use of her Moral Theology. Even her popular pamphlets, to be had at her doors, reveal how alert she is in laying hold of whatever may serve her purposes in strengthening her hold on her people. I sometimes think that she has already done a day's work in these and other things before the Protestant Churches have awaked in the morning. However, that may be, I am convinced that the whole field of Pastoral Theology requires to be re-surveyed by the theological colleges, and methods remodelled and a new literature produced to meet the needs of to-morrow. They will have to go deeper than the advice of

one good man to his young brethren and give scientific reasons for the things they enjoin. In short,—do we not need a Moral Theology and some skill in its practice?

One other subject demands notice. What about Religious Education? How are we to define it? Where are we to place it in a theological curriculum? In so far as it has to do with the right training of children and youth in the Christian religion, importance must be given to it. After worship the teaching of its young in the best way is surely a church's first duty. It must strive to be a true mother with the solicitude of a mother's heart for them all. And ministers must be trained to understand and give leadership in such vitally important work. "Lovest thou me? Feed my lambs" must be a divine commission holding the heart of every true minister of Christ. In all that, there can be no ground for difference of opinion.

When what is now called Religious Education first appeared among us, it came as a Methodology, as Religious Pedagogy, and found its place as a subject in Practical Theology. I have noticed that certain seminaries have recently resolved that so it shall be called in their curriculum. By that, they evidently mean that for them Religious Education stands for the teaching of the historic Christian Faith, as their Communion understand it, by the best educational methods to their own young people. So far, so good, for that presents no difficulty in a theological college. It is an effort to put into practice the best pædæutic, to bring up a child in a way true to its nature so that when it is old it may not depart from it. That can only be welcomed with joy by us all.

But to-day Religious Education claims a far wider function, and seeks to fill out its spacious name by dealing with the whole fields of religion and of education. It is religion, biology, theology, psychology and pædæutics all in one. Indeed, nothing that touches human life seems to be foreign to it. It pre-empt's for itself as part of its territory the whole Biblical, theological, and educational fields, and with a vast literature of a kind, and a terminology that is at least wonderfully made, and many changes in positions and of theories that keep those in pursuit breathless, it not only invades but threatens to usurp the ancient dominion of theological training. It can be summary in its methods as it is ambitious in its schemes. It dismisses with a wave of the hand much that has hitherto been held sacred in the Christian Faith and important in theological education. Like Cromwell in Ireland, its policy is "thorough," so that many not re-actionary people are wondering where it is heading and what the issues are to be. Some of its devotees would boldly say—"A new religion, a better, modernly-made Christianity, indeed, a conquering Christianity, because scientifically grounded and scientifically

taught." It is a great claim. But I have a suspicion that the historic faith will survive after many of its theories are forgotten; and I sometimes wish that some Religious Educationalists knew intelligently the theology which they so vociferously denounce.

And yet some of these efforts at a new religion cannot fail to cause heart-searching in theological colleges, for the positions still taken in a sane theology are often boldly contrasted with those held by Religious Education to the detriment of the former. In some phases, Religious Education is developing a theology all its own, in others it eschews theology altogether. Here, for example, is a description in an "advanced" journal of some aspects of the recent annual Conference gathered in its name:—

"The five hundred leaders present brought five hundred different definitions of religion and five hundred conceptions of science. One man, with a great mass, of wiry hair, evidently a most militant saint, insisted upon testifying for his "Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, the lily of the valley and bright and morning star," quoting interminably and indiscriminately from the Old and New Testament. A lady rose in season and out of season in an effort to demonstrate what to her seemed self-evident, that "God is a proton." It is to be said in frankness that probably every attendant went away with his religious definitions and his scientific conceptions quite unchanged.

How many participants of historic theology were present I do not know, but apparently the number was very small. Probably the ordinary Fundamentalist is not attracted to an organization that invites to membership not only the Universalist, but the Unitarian and even the Jew. There may have been more present than we thought, but, if so, they must have been shocked into indignant silence.

The radical group was large and proud and aggressive. Its members almost monopolized debate and gloried in doubts and denials. They seemed to take vast satisfaction in declaring, as though they had thrown off some dreadful incubus, that *of course* they no longer believed in any entity they could call God, that *of course* they accepted none of the legends about the peasant of Galilee, that *of course* they had abandoned the custom of prayer. They greatly admired Professor James H. Leuba, psychologist from Bryn Mawr, who holds that any social relations with the Deity are impossible and that any prayer except "the prayer of effort" is folly, but they far out-distanced him in their negations. It became apparent that the type of thought that Unitarians call "Humanism" is widely prevalent in supposedly Evangelical churches. A statement that seemed to win approval was made by a gen-

tleman who said that it was ridiculous to teach little children about "the loving care of a Heavenly Father," inasmuch as no person of intelligence could find in the universe evidence of either care or Deity.

It was a "high-brow" convention, composed of those who were intellectually eminent, those who thought they were intellectually eminent, and those who wished they were intellectually eminent. Probably nine-tenths of the members had earned degrees from the great Universities. Was there some tendency to depend on education rather than original thought? Yes. Was there some temptation to befog expression by the multiplication of polysyllables? Yes. Yet a little technical language did no harm, and I was pleased to learn at the final conference the exact relation between specificity of conduct and specificity of ethical attitude."

I notice also that so sane a theologian as Dr. Adams-Brown valiantly did his best for a theology hitherto considered Christian, and was not without some support in what seemed a menagerie of religious and irreligious opinions. But surely the movement is in some danger of running wild, and theological colleges with a specific work to do, must seriously consider their relation to it. On the one hand they cannot but welcome a sound pedagogy, they must be open minded to any wisdom in theology that comes from those who train children in the faith of Christ; for in such blessed work they may get great visions of the Father; but, on the other hand, they assuredly have a duty to ask—What, after all, is Religious Education? What grounds has it for its claims and pretensions? What place is it to occupy in their midst? Let us take what is sound and helpful in it, in the hope that all our students may benefit and that some of them may give themselves to it as their life-task, for the Christian Faith has never yet been so taught to the children of our Churches and of the world that we can afford to neglect one streak of light or any method that will advance Christ's reign in our midst. In my judgment, however, it can never take the place of a sound seminary training for ministers, but it may be a useful part of it to be welcomed at its true value. But that differs somewhat from its not altogether modest claims.

So we come back to the old position—God makes ministers, Colleges can only train them. The risen Lord gives them to his Church as his best gifts; it is the specific business of the theological colleges to lead forth into strength and to discipline into usefulness the gifts that Christ has given and the Church has nourished. Its concern is with the whole man, pre-eminently the man in his spiritual activities. Here it abides forever true that a man's work can never be better than the man himself. The Church needs prophets, teachers, fearless leaders in things of the Spirit, who are ready to turn

from all other forms of service where results are more quickly had, and give themselves to the high and hard task of working patiently with God to lead men and nations to the uplands of life. Colleges can help to provide them only by stirring and nourishing in men the divine chivalries and by teaching them how to confront the world with Christ and justify His ways with men. Academic achievement is now invaluable, but more is necessary; a knowledge of varied technique is useful, but it is futile without wealth from the deep mines of God. High intelligence is imperative, but it is not the one thing needful. Only by living in the climate of the Spirit can prophets be reared.

SOCIAL ASPECTS OF THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY TRAINING

PROFESSOR JEROME DAVIS,
Yale Divinity School

The theological seminary exists to train men so that they may spread the contagion of the life and spirit of Jesus our Master. They are to be the pathfinders of the Christ Way in each generation. It is obvious that this cannot be done effectively unless an effort is made to Christianize the community pattern of conduct. It is not my purpose to posit any authoritative picture of what should be done, but, rather, to raise certain questions for discussion.

I suppose that if there is any one fact about which we are all agreed it is that we are living in the midst of a revolutionized and a changed society. Think of these facts, among others. Science has unlocked so many of the hidden mysteries of life that some would substitute science for God. Distance has been so shattered by radio and airplane that in point of time the world is smaller to-day than was our country at the foundation of this republic. We have passed through an industrial revolution. The character of the home has been altered.

All this raises the question whether church and seminary have kept pace with the changes. Has there been a lag between the new emerging social order and the old conserving religious training?

It would be surprising if there had not been such a lag. The large number of small theological schools prohibits adequate training in the social field for many. Even now the cost is high. Dr. Kelley found that in 1919-20 the annual cost to society for the public elementary school was \$39 per child, for the secondary school \$127, for the college, university, and professional school \$466, while the per capita cost of theological education ranged from \$100 to \$5,000.

In the old days, prior to the development of the great modern university, our scattered denominational institutions were not so handicapped; they far surpassed other training schools. To-day the college student inevitably compares the seminary with the elaborate equipment of such schools as medicine and law.

The lag of adjustment to present social conditions is also shown by the fact that some of our theological seminaries are isolated from the newer industrial and economic danger zones. A student may do outside work in a church, but he rarely *even thinks* of trying to Christianize a trade union.

The fact is that the very word "seminary" comes from the Latin and means "a nursery garden." We must guard against

the danger which the name implies. In some way our students must have contact with the areas of desperate need.

Should the church in America serve primarily the prosperous or even the middle class alone, or those who are most in need, as Jesus did? Protestantism has left relatively neglected the poorer working class. In some way the theological seminary must meet the difficulty which comes because of the proportionately larger salaries of ministers who serve the well-to-do and middle classes. There is danger that the best students will be drafted into the most prosperous churches. It is conceivable that in religious work for labor we may either have to permit the minister to carry on other activities to supplement his income or we shall have to pool ministerial salaries so that the well-to-do churches may add their quota to those who are serving in more needy fields. It is doubtful if present contributions to home missions sufficiently solve this problem.

Again, have we reshaped our curriculum, placing sufficient emphasis on sociology, psychology, religious education, and social ethics?

No less an authority than Canon Headlam, Professor of Divinity at Oxford, believes that we have not. Not only would he have a larger social emphasis, but he says: "A considerable change is necessary in our methods of teaching the Old and New Testament. We shall have to take a good deal of our textual criticism and grammar and philology for granted; we shall have to shorten the time that we devote to purely critical studies; we shall have to devote much more time to the religious teaching *in reference particularly to the actual demands of the present day.*" That, coming from Oxford, is interesting.

Science is making this problem more acute. For we are no longer concerned so much with the exact interpretation of a Biblical verse. The challenge which the church faces to-day is, first, whether there shall be any belief at all in a Christ-like God; and, second, whether the ethical teachings of Christ shall be translated into the social order.

There are many in America who feel that in spite of the increase in the number of courses in practical theology, the social emphasis is far too small. To be sure, it has become increasingly clear that the use of the term "the individual," as contrasted with "the social" gospel is often misleading. There are not two gospels, but one: a whole gospel. We cannot really love God without loving man. But because this is true, there are those who feel that the social side has been relatively neglected. They point to the social action of the prophets and to the social teachings of Jesus. They declare that modern psychology has taught us the necessity of translating theoretical values into personal behaviour patterns.

We live our way into our thinking much more than we think our way into our living. To some extent this means that men cannot learn the Christian life except by practicing it. We must translate our loyalties not only into personal work but into social action. Experience of the real world is a part of vital instruction about it. Christianity is not lived in a vacuum. Participation in industrial and social life is essential to moral life. Religious education to-day recognizes that the building up of moral ideals entirely divorced from experience is questionable. In the Sunday School illustrations must be drawn as nearly as possible from life as the child experiences it. Applying this to the adult means the application of Christ's teachings to industrial, racial, and political relations—in short, to the entire range of conduct which makes up community life. William James posited the theory that physical action of itself creates a corresponding attitude. Woodworth, of Columbia, says: "Group activity is interesting for its own sake. Helping the group, itself *generates* the desire to be helpful."

Philosophy and science both posit similar conclusions. John Dewey, for instance, defines character as "intelligent desire to do good, which is shown by resolute endeavor. If there are no outward evidences of effort and action, the character is not formed."

Sociology clearly shows that the social environment itself helps to create sin and also goodness. Jacob Riis once estimated that environment counts for ninety per cent. of character. While sociology would not support this ratio, it does recognize that as long as we have bad environments we shall inevitably have faulty individuals. Because all this is true many believe that the seminary must train men socially, so that they can practise a social as well as an individual evangelism. Probably the greatest indictment which is made against the Russian church is on the ground of its almost utter lack of social action. We ought to guard against this weakness in America.

The changing social order has also raised doubts in the minds of multitudes about our old ethical codes. Even such an institution as the home is being attacked. Men ask, why not the companionate marriage? Is not even free love justifiable? To prepare the minister for such problems, will not the seminary have to treat the relations between the sexes in a more fundamental and thorough manner?

The most original and distinctive feature of Christianity in relation to other faiths is its ethical character. Should we not make certain, therefore, that the seminary provides adequate training in Christian and social ethics? Yet Dr. Kelley, in his study of *Theological Education in America*, says: "It is

a fair question whether the seminaries, as a group of schools, are centers of ethical power."

In the early history of America the minister was looked up to as a leader of intellectual thought. At the present time parishioners often think that they have had a better training than the minister. The layman no longer takes the message of the minister as the final authority even on moral and ethical programs. The business man feels that he knows more about the ethical requirements of community life, and certainly of his own business, than the minister. The result is often a divorce between the teachings of the church and the practice of prominent Christian laymen.

This raises the question whether the ministry of to-day, and in some measure the theological seminary, is not in danger of being unconsciously lulled into acquiescence with the failures of our capitalistic civilization. Is the church a class institution? Does it take over patriotic and nationalistic attitudes which may be grossly at variance with the spirit of the Prince of Peace?

Social psychology teaches us that the pressure of the average mind is to conform to the *status quo*. But the minister should always be the one leader who is calling men back from practices which may be popular, established, and respectable, and yet out of harmony with the teachings of Jesus and with the highest interests of social welfare. He must continually be raising disturbing social questions before situations lead to disaster. There is a constant interaction going on between the church and our social order; which will gain the victory? Will the church remake the economic order more in harmony with the Christ spirit, or will the economic order reshape the church to be more in harmony with the spirit of profits? Tawney, in his admirable book on "Religion and the Rise of Capitalism," has shown how the church has been unconsciously warped in the direction of capitalistic values. Yet he says: "Capitalism is that whole system of appetites and values, with its deification of the life of snatching to hoard and hoarding to snatch, which now, in the hour of its triumph, while the plaudits of the crowd still ring in the ears of the gladiators and the laurels are still unfaded on their brows, seem sometimes to leave a taste as of ashes on the lips of a civilization which has brought to the conquest of its material environment resources unknown in earlier ages, but which has not yet learned to master itself." He says that the saints and sages of earlier ages launched their warnings and denunciations against this system. With modern boards of trustees and the necessity for large giving by men of wealth there is an unconscious tendency to play safe. Unless the theological seminary adequately guards against this, it may mean a subservient religion. In Russia we have seen how

the dominant political party is combatting the teachings of the church on two counts: first, that the God idea is a superstitious myth, totally untrue; and, second, that the church has always been used by the dominant group for its own selfish advantage.

I have just been preparing for publication a symposium of the attitudes of labor leaders throughout the world toward the church and religion. The majority believe that the church has a capitalistic and a nationalistic bias; it is a class institution for the upper and middle classes. Kagawa, of Japan, for instance, says: "Labor considers the church too other-worldly. It thinks it has no concern with the interests of labor; and that the church has lost her aim in this world and is looking up only into heaven. Labor stops thinking about religion and religion stops thinking about labor."

George Lansbury, the well-known labor editor, of England, says: "Ordinary working people in Britain think very little about the churches, or about religion. Not that they can be said to be hostile to either, but simply because for huge masses of our people the churches do not exist. . . . Men who from 1914 to 1918 saw the churches of all denominations taking part in recruiting and singing hymns of war and offering prayers to a God of war, revolt against such a travesty of Christ's teaching."

James Maurer, President of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, says: "To go to church and listen to sermons about the goodness of God and the necessity of meekly bearing one's burdens—such sermons naturally sound pleasing to the ears of the wealthy listeners, and the usual reward is a shower of gold and hearty congratulations by the sleek and well-fed members of the congregation. But to an intelligent worker such sermons sound like capitalistic propaganda—Sunday buncombe. . . . The local papers of Harrisburg in 1918 devoted more than a column to interviews with the city's clergymen as to what they would do to the Kaiser if he were their prisoner. Some said: 'Hang him by the thumbs and let him starve;' another said: 'Bury him up to his neck and then place food and water in front of him and let him die.' Only one advocated mercy."

Mr. Maurer goes on to ask: "How often during the lifetime of a worker does he see the pastor of his church, or does the pastor of *any* church visit and mingle among the workers in the factories? The clergyman does not seem to know that the factory is as close to the church as the church is to the factory, and that there he can do as much good and serve God just as well as he can in his church, and besides learn more about the actual affairs of industry and problems of life in one day than he can in a month sitting in his study reading second-hand

opinions of others who may not be any better informed than he is himself."

I quote from these selections (to all of which we might take exceptions or make qualification) merely to show the attitudes which the minister will have to face. There must be some cause for these attitudes. Is not one reason our failure to train religious leaders for constructive work in the field of labor?

At the present time in America we still have industrial autocracy, with all the evils in its wake. Nearly two-thirds of our workers do not have any form of representation. Ministers must be taught how they can help Christianize this field.

At the invitation of the management I have just visited the largest airplane factory in the world. Here was the latest mechanical miracles of our age being turned out swiftly by the last scientific devices; yet on the human side there were being used the most antiquated and ineffective methods of a century ago; no representation, low wages, bad health conditions.

The Copec Conference, in its final conclusions, speaking on "Industry and prosperity," says: "The result of our enquiry is saddening. It brings out very clearly the dangerous and in many ways disastrous consequences which have ensued from the rapid advance in the use of those very forces which should have benefitted the whole society."

In consequence of the changed conditions there is a profound difference in the application of ethical codes to life. The church used to be concerned with individual questions of conduct. Honesty, purity, thrift were strongly stressed, and rightly so. At the present time many of the most important phases of character development are dependent on social action. A man may be a model of virtue personally and yet be violating most of the Ten Commandments in the corporation in which he holds stock. A man may be a strong supporter of the church and yet treat his employees very badly. Theological training must continually adjust itself to the changed conditions. This means that it must be a training ground for prophets. The prophetic leader must be so equipped that he can speak vitally on the evils of our state and of our economic order. Should not each seminary deliberately plan to have several prophetic souls on its faculty? Of necessity these teachers must be given the utmost freedom, even if frequent criticism results.

Jesus was the supreme master in condemning the spirit of wealth for wealth's sake. Every religious teacher, really effectively to apply the teachings of Jesus in his own age, must see clearly the existing injustice. We must teach the student to see the dualism, for instance, between the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount and the practice of industrial relations

in the average industrial plant. There is a very real danger that the seminary student will be unconsciously led to engage only in customary and conventional activities which are safe and respectable. Professor Whitehead, of Harvard, states this danger: "Religion is tending to degenerate into a decent formula wherewith to embellish a comfortable life. . . . Religion will not regain its power until it can apply its spirit to life. . . . It is the non-religious motive in disguise which is responsible for the comfortable organization of modern life. But the worship of God is not a rule of safety; it is an adventure of the spirit, a flight after the unattainable. It is the business of religion to be dangerous." Our churches have a tendency, as Dr. Luccock points out, of being insipid.

To meet the new and disguised dangers of our time, there must be specific courses dealing with these evils, even if they are controversial. No student of any religious institution should leave without being challenged with the subtle evils of materialism, of the profit motive, or of the will to be rich.

In urging training in the fields of industry, race, and internationalism I do not necessarily mean to imply that the minister should be an expert in any of these lines. Much less do I wish to say that the minister should run his parishioners' factories. My point is rather that he should be sufficiently informed so that he could intelligently call in experts to teach his people. He should also be able persuasively to stand for great social and moral principles embodied in such historic documents as the Social Creed of the Churches. These principles, once they are adopted by the Federal Council of Churches and most of the Protestant denominations, are usually ignored or forgotten by the rank and file of church membership. Unless the minister is trained along social lines, he will rarely be effective in leading his church members to the new standards.

All of the changing ethical problems which we have mentioned lead many to ask whether there is not need of experimentation in the teaching technique of the theological seminary. Have we not over-emphasized the lecture method? In courses in practical theology the student needs not so much to have a content of material poured into his mind as a receptacle, but to be aroused to do thinking for himself. Is it not possible to use projects, problems, the case method, clinics, supervised field work, discussion, and social research? A department of field work, with a full-time paid director, is obviously essential. This could correlate the theoretical instruction in the different fields of the theological seminary with its application outside.

We have not always used even the summer vacation very effectively. Why should not every student be required to submit to the professor in charge of his major department a

written report of each summer's activity? As a small beginning in this direction at Yale we have organized summer work in industry; we send students to the Ford Motor Company, where they work side by side with labor throughout the entire summer. The Ford Company arranges classes for them once a week, and the State Student Secretary of the Y. M. C. A. arranges additional meetings. Other students are employed in different factories. The pooling of experience is invaluable. A two-day conference is held at the beginning of the summer and at its end. Each student is required to send in a detailed report of his findings and prizes aggregating \$210 are awarded for the best papers submitted. No effort is made to have a student go more than once for industrial experience. It seems probable that the city pastor would find such a summer's experience invaluable in later trying to humanize industrial situations in his community.

Another experimental technique which has great promise is that of the case method. It has been used in the fields of medicine and law and has recently been introduced into the Harvard Business School. So far, the theological seminaries have not, to any great extent, utilized this very valuable tool for educational training and research. There seems to be no inherent reason why the case method cannot be used in some of the courses in the theological seminary. Experimenting along this line, the most difficult problem seems to be to secure actual case records. Personally, I have secured some from the files of the various home missionary societies, where regular reports and letters from individual churches running over, perhaps, a twenty or thirty year period are available. This data should be secured from churches which are more or less typical of immigrant, industrial, rural, and other environments frequently met by theological students. The students are asked to analyze these records, to determine where the minister made his mistakes, and to indicate the methods which should have been used in the situation described. This is analogous to the work required of men in training for business administration at Harvard.

I have also developed some case records by writing to various ministers throughout the country who have done notable work in a particular field. They have outlined the conditions of the church when they started their activity, showing just the problems which confronted them. The student is then asked to outline what he would do in that given situation. After the student has submitted his report and discussed the problem, we then state the records of what actually had been done and what has been the result. It should be possible to have a certain number of theological students prepare case records of work in the churches with which they are connected.

Whatever the methods, we must be sure that we give our

students sufficient freedom to permit the emergence of prophets and moral leaders.

To make concrete this discussion and by way of a summary, may I outline some courses which it seems to me the average seminary might make available for its students?

First, there should be an adequate department of field work which would gear in the practical work done outside with all the departments in the theological seminary. This would mean a very close correlation of field work with classroom theory.

Second, every student should be required to have a thorough grounding in psychological and sociological thought. If he has not secured this in college, he ought to have it in the seminary. He is going to mold public opinion on moral issues, and unless he understands to some extent the group mind and the influence of the group upon his own thinking, he is severely handicapped in all his work. The student ought to be introduced to the technique of prophetic minority leadership. One of the dangers of our American religious life is unconscious yielding to majority opinion. The student must be made to see that he must always oppose the majority at the point where that majority infringes on the maximum of good-will and co-operation for all. This means, for instance, that he will be trained effectively to stand opposed to the profit motive, the quest for gold, even if a majority in the community are under its sway. He must forever be calling men back to human values. Our business leaders must be made to see that perhaps the greatest service they can render is in their own factories.

The theological seminaries should also train men adequately in social work. This does not mean that they necessarily have to be expert social workers, but it does mean that they should be able to have a reciprocal, co-operative relationship with the social agencies. At the present time many social workers tell me that they get less co-operation from the church than from any other of the great modern institutions.

Each seminary should also have adequate courses in rural work. When we consider that there are to-day over a hundred thousand rural churches in the United States and over thirty million farm people who must attend these churches or none at all, we can realize something of the importance of the problem. There are over four million children and young people under twenty-one years of age who have to be reached through the rural church. A recent study of the Institute of Social and Religious Surveys in New York reveals that there are sixteen thousand farm children living in communities where there are no Sunday Schools or churches of any denomination.

Every theological seminary should provide training in the

technique of the community survey. It may not be necessary, perhaps, to equip the minister for detailed scientific surveys, but he ought to know how to get certain outstanding facts about existing conditions.

The theological seminary, to meet modern conditions, should train students very definitely in the ethical aspects of current social problems. The student should be made familiar with the problems of family life, economic, class, and racial conflict, and how the church ought to help in their solution. He ought to know something of the larger social movements, such as the labor movement, the co-operative movement, socialism, Bolshevism, and capitalism. If we do not train our theological students to understand these larger movements, it is hardly probable that they will evaluate them afterwards from an ethical and moral standpoint. The attempt should be made throughout to show how the minister could assume social leadership in meeting the problems presented. Laboratory trips of observation can furnish the student first-hand contact with the problems discussed.

It may also prove valuable to set up specialized lines of activity near the seminary in order to give students an opportunity to pioneer along new lines. With this in mind, at New Haven we have placed students in religious work in the county jail and with labor unions.

Since it is extremely difficult to reproduce varying attitudes in the classroom, it may also be of advantage to call in speakers to present different points of view. This has proved of particular value to me in courses on industry, where I have labor leaders and captains of industry speak directly to the students and answer their questions.

Very frequently much can be done to provoke extra-curriculum thinking. With this in mind we have established at Yale a discussion cottage on the seashore to which students can go to formulate group projects or to meet with outside leaders. In the course of the school year this cottage is used by approximately a thousand students.

Should not the theological seminary also develop more social and ethical research than it is perhaps now attempting? Because of its failure in this respect it is charged with being unscientific, lacking in facts, and warped in its judgment. It would be easy to make studies of the distribution of churches in given communities, the length of time which a church is able to maintain itself in a given environment, what happens to it when it adapts itself to a new program, or moves to a new environment. Charts should be made showing the correlation of economic and social conditions with the membership and location of churches in particular districts. The industrialization of a given district often means the removal of a Protestant church or the readaptation of its program, gen-

erally the former. Research might also cover the ethical evaluation of industrial policies from the standpoint of human values; the realities of the local government; the facts regarding bossism, health and the problems of sex, education, recreation, housing, the immigrant and his family, the dependent, the delinquent, and the defective.

I have just been securing the returns from a thousand churches on the Social Composition of the Boards of Control of Protestant Churches. It seems to indicate control by the professional classes. It is doubtful whether such scientific surveys can always be published; it is often so much easier to publish opinions than statistical data.

It is my personal belief that it would be very helpful if we could have a careful survey of the actual task of the minister as it is now being carried on in his church and in his community. It might also prove useful if each seminary could send out a questionnaire to every graduate of five to ten years' standing asking for an appraisal of the nature of his theological work and for suggestions of change. This would give us some check on the work we are doing.

As a result of the facts secured from such a survey we could much more effectively change our courses and our methods.

In conclusion, may I restate some of the questions which I have raised?

1. How can the theological seminary remodel its curriculum in the light of the changed economic order and in the light of increased scientific knowledge? What should be the proportion of time which the student devotes to ethical and social studies in relation to what used to be considered more fundamental subjects?

2. Is there a necessity for experimentation in a new teaching technique?

3. How can we guard against the dangers of being unconsciously lulled into acquiescence with the failures of our capitalistic civilization? How can we train students to be effective leaders against wrong racial, class, and national attitudes? Can we reshape the state and the economic order so that they may serve the common good?

4. How can we train our students to apply the spirit of Christ to new social and economic situations which defy the old moralities? How can we train men for leadership in minority movements of moral power?

5. How can we send our graduates into the areas of greatest need rather than into the areas of comfort and affluence?

In all the proposals suggested we are but trying to make our seminaries more effective instruments in Christianizing our

social order. Naturally we must be careful that in programs, surveys, even in talking about Christ, we do not lose the spirit of Christ. Our supreme aim in the social field as elsewhere is to make His principles and spirit triumphant in both individual and social life.

THE THEOLOGY OF CRISIS¹

BY ALBERT C. KNUDSON

Boston University, School of Theology

Toward the close of the World War, in August, 1918, there appeared a rather bulky German commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. It was written by Karl Barth, then a young Swiss pastor, who, since 1911, had been in charge of the church at Safenwil in the canton of Aargau. The book differed noticeably both in form and content from the ordinary commentary; and these differences were hardly such as to commend it to New Testament scholars. Very little attention was devoted to the questions of textual and literary criticism and to the details of a purely verbal exegesis. Interest was centered in the fundamental teaching of the Apostle; and this teaching the author did not hesitate to translate into terms so different from those employed by Paul himself and his past interpreters that he was charged with foisting upon the Apostle his own peculiar views. But whatever defects of this kind the book may have had and however much of "an erratic black" it may have been in the exegetical literature of the day, it was characterized by such vigor and independence of thought and by such profound religious earnestness that pastors and laymen soon began in such rapidly increasing numbers to read and study it, that the theologians were forced to take account of it. The verdict of the latter was on the whole unfavorable, but some believed; and since that time the theology of Karl Barth has been by far the liveliest topic in theological circles in Germany. Nor has its influence been confined to those who speak German. It has been appreciably felt in Hungary and Holland, and today is attracting the attention of the entire theological world. A Roman Catholic writer has spoken of Barth's book on Romans as a bomb falling "on the playground of the theologians."

The first edition of this book was much less radical than the second. What characterized it and the earlier form of Barth's theology was a pronounced antipathy to modern evolutionism and an attempt to revive the biblical conception of the world. As pastor, Barth had been an earnest student of Scripture, and in seeking to impart to his people "the Word of God" had become deeply impressed by the contrast between the biblical "*Weltbild*" or world-picture and that of modern thought. The modern man is an evolutionist. He believes that there are forces resident within nature or within the human spirit that guarantee, or, at least, make probable an indefinite progress of mankind. Whether this progress be

¹ Reprint by permission from the *Methodist Review* with a few minor changes and additions.

conceived naturalistically or idealistically, did not, according to Barth, make much difference. In either case reliance is placed upon man himself or upon forces immanent within him. Evolution is thought of as a human affair, an affair that implies the self-sufficiency of man or of nature as expressed in man. And this is the very antithesis of the biblical view. Here attention is centered on God; he is the one ground of confidence and hope. By way of contrast man is impotent and sinful; he cannot improve his own condition or save himself. No real progress is possible to him through his own effort. It is only through divine intervention that man can be redeemed. This is the basic teaching of Scripture; it is the truth that underlies the Biblical apocalyptic or eschatology. And so Barth, as a preacher of the Word, opposed the eschatological to the modern evolutionary view.

The eschatological or apocalyptic viewpoint brings out in an impressive way the dependence both of humanity and of the individual man on God. It also contains another significant religious motive. It brings men face to face with the eternal. Nothing is more characteristic of the prophetic messages in the Old and New Testaments than this. Their keynote is the declaration that the Kingdom of God is at hand. Most people live in a state of false security. They have no realization of the moral gravity of life. To them things are as they seem, and life has no further meaning. But to the prophetic mind the world stands before the judgment seat of the Almighty; it is confronted with an imminent crisis. This truth it was that Jesus and the prophets sought to bring home to the people of their day. They tried to shake the people out of their moral and spiritual lethargy by directing their attention to the impending end of things. To a large degree this was the burden of their messages, and that there was in it a great religious dynamic is evident to every serious student of Scripture. It is not, therefore, strange, that a preacher of the Word like Barth, profoundly dissatisfied with the underlying spirit of modernism, should seize upon it as a rallying center for the life and thought of an apparently declining Protestantism. As the preaching of the prophets and the apostles was eschatological, so, he felt, the preaching of our day must be, if it is to regain its lost power. And what is true of our preaching must also be true of our theology. It must become an apocalyptic eschatology or, in other words, a theology of crisis.

The eschatology which Barth advocated in 1918 was not biblical in the literalistic sense of the term, but it was biblical in the sense that it looked forward to the emergence of the eternal in the order of time, and it was also biblical in the sense that it left a place for the present activity of God in the world. Indeed, in the first edition of *"Der Roemerbrief"*

Barth found the quintessence of the Pauline preaching in the conviction that the life of God has "broken through" into this fallen world, that it entered human history in Christ Jesus, and that it is active in those who believe. The Kingdom of God he, consequently, regarded as already here and in process of development. The development is wholly due to the divine initiative, but it is development nevertheless. It differs from the evolution in which the modern man believes simply in this that it is transcendently or divinely grounded. The Kingdom comes from above; it is not evolved from below. The agency operative in its establishment is the Holy Spirit, but the Holy Spirit is a human possession. It works in and through men and in this way prepares the way for the coming of a "new world." The new world, in its fullness, may come suddenly through a marvellous divine intervention—such is the teaching of Scripture—but it is already here in germ, and when it comes in power it will be as it is now, a kingdom on this earth, a temporal kingdom.²

Such was the theology of crisis in its earlier form. The second or later stage was initiated by the publication of the second edition of *'Der Roemerbrief'* in 1922. Here we find a revolutionary change. Of the first edition, as Barth himself said, not one stone remained upon another. The general situation and fundamental teachings are now quite different. What Barth in the second edition is concerned with is something profounder and more perplexing than the conflict between a naturalistic or humanly-conditioned evolution, on the one hand, and a divinely-grounded evolution, on the other. The problem he here deals with is the relation of time to eternity, and the conclusion he adopts, proclaims, and expounds is this, that there is "an endless qualitative difference" between time and eternity, a difference so absolute that no "breaking through" of the eternal into the temporal order is possible.

This new and fundamental dualism had various sources. The post-war pessimism, no doubt, played a part in it. So also did the reading of such radical critics of our civilization as Nietzsche, Dostojewski, Kutter, and Overbeck. Particularly significant was the influence of Kierkegaard, the Danish rebel against official Christianity. Indeed, Barth is not infrequently spoken of as a disciple of Kierkegaard. It was from him that he borrowed the expression "the endless qualitative difference between time and eternity." To these influences he himself adds that growing out of a deeper study of Plato and Kant.

²*Roemerbrief*, pp. 106, 109, 113; *Das Wort Gottes und die Theologie*, pp. 12, 26, 31 f.

Barth's Apologetic Purpose

But however important these influences were they were all subordinated to a profound apologetic purpose. This purpose may not have been always clearly conceived. Perhaps Barth would have been reluctant even to admit it. Nevertheless, to the critical student of his theology, it is evident that what he at bottom is concerned about is the uniqueness and absoluteness of religion and particularly of Christianity.³ This phrasing of his fundamental problem he would himself repudiate. But the question at issue in that case would be one chiefly of words. He would substitute the word "faith" for "religion," and would probably insist that he was a *witness* to revelation and not an *apologist* for it. Be that as it may, his ultimate concern is with the independence and absoluteness of religion, as that term is commonly understood. In this respect the second edition of his commentary on *Romans* may be classed along with Schleiermacher's *Discourses* and *The Idea of the Holy*, by Rudolf Otto. Its aim is also akin to that of the various recent attempts to establish a "*religious a priori*."

In the first edition of this work Barth, as we have seen, directed his fire chiefly against the current naturalistic and humanistic evolutionism and opposed to it a theistically grounded evolutionism and apocalypticism. He saw in the world of space and time the tabernacle of God gradually taking shape and awaiting a final denouement through the agency of the Divine Spirit; and in the possession of the Holy Spirit thus accorded to men here and now he found the answer to life's deepest question. But this left faith a temporal affair, exposed to a devastating psychological analysis and historical criticism; and here it now seemed to Barth, in the second stage of his theological development, was a more serious foe to religion than modern evolutionism. Evolutionism does not necessarily exclude a religious interpretation of the world and of human life, but a thoroughgoing psychologism and historicism apparently does. This type of current thought denies to faith all absoluteness, and thus robs it of that which constitutes its very essence, namely, truth. Somehow or other religious relativism must, therefore, be overcome if faith is to survive.

How this may be done was the problem with which Schleiermacher and Otto also dealt. But they did not direct their attention chiefly to it. Schleiermacher was primarily concerned with overcoming the moralistic rationalism of the *Aufklärung* and Otto with correcting the tendency toward a rationalistic moralism in Ritschlianism. Then, too, the answers, which they gave to the fundamental question of apolo-

³See Rudolf Bultmann in *Christliche Welt*, 1922, Col. 320.

getics, left us where the first edition of Barth's commentary did, in the realm of human experience, which according to Barth's later view is a realm of shifting sand, entirely incapable of bearing the weight of absolute truth. Nor did the idea of a religious *a priori*, advocated by Otto and more particularly by Troeltsch, help out. For it finds the basis of religion in human reason, which is limited to the temporal order and condemned to subjectivity when it seeks to transcend it. Relativism is irresistible so long as we remain on the empirical or rational plane. But relativism means the death of religion. So Barth sought to overcome it by a new and more radical method than any yet tried. He threw religion in its historic sense to the relativistic wolves. He denied to it any normative or ideal element. "The religious impulse," he said, "differs from the need of sleep only in degree."⁴ But at the same time he insisted that faith is something quite different from the empirical and rational interpretations of it heretofore given. It is a miracle, wrought in us by God, by means of which we in some ineffable way lay hold of him or rather he of us. He is eternal and as such the negation of time. By no temporal act can he be apprehended, and yet in some miraculous way he reveals himself to a faith which he himself creates and which as such stands apart from the temporal flow and is ultimate and absolute. The religion of faith has, therefore, nothing to fear from scientific and philosophic relativism. It belongs to a super-empirical and super-rational realm, the realm of the eternal, which is not and cannot be subject to the law of time.

The Barthian Dialectic

In expounding this conception of faith and of the relation of time and eternity to each other Barth employs the "dialectic" method. Indeed, so persistently does he employ it in the second edition of "*Der Roemerbrief*" that "the theology of crisis" comes now to be known as the "dialectic" theology. The crisis-motive is retained, but it is transformed or rather transfigured. It ceases to be apocalyptic and becomes dialectic. That is, the end or crisis confronting the world is no longer thought of as itself temporal. It is the *end* of all time, its negation, and as such stands as a perpetual threat to human complacency. No further catastrophe is necessary to pass sentence of condemnation upon the world. The world is already condemned; by its very nature it stands face to face with an eternal crisis. This note pervades the whole of Barth's later theology; and from this point of view it is sometimes called the "critical" theology.⁵ It looks upon the world as in a critical condition, as "sick unto death." It is, however,

⁴*Roemerbrief*, p. 219.

⁵Cf. Karl Barth's "*Kritische Theologie*," by Th. L. Haitjema.

also a "critical" theology in the Kantian as well as the eschatological sense. For Barth subjects the theological epistemology of the past to a searching criticism in much the same way that Kant did the philosophical and scientific epistemology of his day. He develops, it is claimed,⁶ more consequentially than has heretofore been done the significance of the subjective factor in religious knowledge. He lays down in a more absolute way the limits beyond which religious thought and experience cannot go, and he expounds more profoundly the necessity and true nature of faith. His theology may then be said to be "critical" in the same sense that Kant's philosophy is. But this use of the term is not common. Barth himself characterizes his theology as "dialectic," and distinguishes the method so designated from the "dogmatic" and the "critical," the word "critical" being understood in a "mystical" and catastrophic sense.⁷ To the two latter methods he ascribes permanent value, but the "dialectic" he declares to be far the best, 'not only because it is the Pauline and Reformation method but because of its intrinsic superiority."

"Dialectic," however, is by no means an unambiguous term. It has had a long history, and has had various meanings attached to it. There is a Socratic dialectic, a Platonic dialectic, and Aristotelian dialectic, an Hegelian dialectic, and also a popular and literary use of the term to denote a highly abstract and *a priori* type of reasoning. Perhaps the most common philosophical use of the term has been the Aristotelian which makes it about equivalent to logic. But the more distinctive use of the term is the Socratic and Hegelian. There it denotes thought in movement, though proceeding by question and answer or by thesis and antithesis. The process is an endless one; no final synthesis is reached by the human spirit. Every synthesis becomes a new thesis and every answer a new question. The ultimate truth is, therefore, never apprehended. It lies midway between question and answer or between thesis and antithesis. It is neither, and yet it is suggested by both. In and of itself it can be grasped neither by concept nor in intuition; it lies beyond both. And yet there is truth in the dialectic process. Its members logically imply each other, so that it may in a sense be said that the question or thesis is the answer or antithesis, and the answer or antithesis is the question or thesis. But the relation is not static, it is one of becoming; and so dialectic is a sort of animated logic.

There is not a little of this kind of dialectic in Barth's writings. He himself likens his own dialectic method to a narrow ledge on which one must keep walking in order "to avoid fall-

⁶Th. L. Haitjema, pp. 34 ff, 149 f, 154.

⁷*Das Wort Gottes und die Theologie*, pp. 167 ff.

ing either to the right or the left.⁸ The positive must be continually balanced by the negative and the negative by the positive. Only thus can we escape falling either into dogmatism or criticism. Dialectic thought is, consequently, in ceaseless movement. It never comes to rest, and so does not allow its objects to congeal into thinghood. They are simply the phases of a thought-process which points to a reality beyond itself, but only points to it. True reality lies midway between our affirmations and our negations. It can be grasped neither conceptually nor intuitively. It is incomprehensible; and hence the only way in which we can properly speak of it is in paradox. But neither paradox nor dialectic in and of itself can lead us to the truth. "There is no human way to God, no *via negative* and no *via dialectica* or *paradoxa*."⁹ No human quest after God can be successful. It can only lead to bafflement. Bafflement, however, is implied in dialectic, and for that very reason the latter is the "best way." Dialectic, in other words, bears upon itself the stamp of its own imperfection. It is the natural expression of man's intellectual infirmity. It implies philosophical skepticism or, at least, a state of philosophical 'suspense,'¹⁰ and this, according to Barth, is the true correlate of faith.

Dialectic, as he conceives it, is not then merely a logical method, it is a propaedeutic to theology. Indeed, it is a common remark on the part of his more friendly critics that his dialectic is to be understood 'theologically' not "philosophically."¹¹ By this two things seem to be meant. First, the theological or religious motive is fundamental with him. It is his theology that determines his philosophy rather than the reverse. His dialectic, consequently, is not a self-sufficient logic that stands in its own right. It is secondary and to be taken seriously only in so far as it serves his theoretical purpose. Again, dialectic, as he uses it, is a dialectic of faith rather than a philosophical dialectic. It has to do with the content of revelation rather than with that of a rationally grounded metaphysics. But while this, no doubt, expresses Barth's intent, it cannot be said that he has succeeded in completely disentangling the two from each other. Nor can it be said that he has a clear and unambiguous conception of what he means by his own dialectic. He occasionally conceives of it in the above sense of an advancing logical process which comes to no end. But this is not the deepest and most characteristic sense in which he conceives of it. Fundamentally his dialectic is not "logical" but 'ontological.'¹² It has to do

⁸*Das Wort Gottes und die Theologie*, p. 172.

⁹Gottes Wort, etc., p. 153.

¹⁰Emil Brunner, *Religionsphilosophie Evangelischer Theologie*, p. 30.

¹¹G. Heinzelmann in *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, 1924, p. 537.

¹²See Hans W. Schmidt, *Zeit und Ewigkeit*, p. 18 ff.

with the mutual exclusiveness of time and eternity, with their radical antithesis, and so moves in the realm of reality rather than in that of thought. This antithesis or dualism is not absolute in the sense that time and eternity stand on the same level. For Barth the eternal alone is positive, it alone is ultimately real. But in the present order the temporal and the eternal represent two distinct realms. One is the realm of sin and death, the other the realm of redemption and life. These two realms stand radically opposed to each other, and it is out of their opposition that the later Barthian dialectic grows.

Man, as sinner, is the thesis, the question, and the antithesis or answer is his justification or redemption through God. This answer, it is true, becomes itself in human thought a question, but the question is not a new one. It is the old one in another form, and so the answer to it is likewise not a new one but the old one. There is, consequently, no real progress in the Barthian dialectic but rather a continual circling about one middle-point, determined by the antithesis between time, sin, and death, on the one hand, and eternity, redemption, and life on the other. The result is a monotonous iteration and reiteration of the same fundamental idea. But it is just in this, as Barth himself says,¹³ that his "system," in so far as he has one, consists. What gives to his later theology its unity and distinctiveness, is the steadiness and persistence with which he has kept in view the endless qualitative difference between time and eternity. From this dialectic viewpoint he has reinterpreted the doctrines of the church and so created what may be called a new theology.

The Barthian School

Thus far we have confined our attention to Karl Barth. But he is not the only representative of the 'dialectic' or "crisis" theology, nor does he occupy a position of such commanding importance in the movement as completely to overshadow the others. He has three friends who have co-operated with him almost from the beginning and who have made important contributions to the literature of the movement. Of these Edward Thurneysen stands closest to him, though he is perhaps the least significant theologically. He and Barth have collaborated in the publication of several volumes of sermons or addresses,¹⁴ and both are regular contributors to *Zwischen den Zeiten*, a magazine established toward the close of the year 1922, as the organ of the new theology. This magazine has met with marked success. It began as a quarterly, but is now published bi-monthly. Thurneysen still remains in

¹³*Der Roemerbrief*, p. xii.

¹⁴*Komm, Schoepfer Geist; Suchet Gott, so werdet ihr leben; zur inneren Lage des Christentums.*

the pastorate, preaching in the village of Bruggen,* near St. Gallen, in Switzerland. Barth resigned his pastorate at Safenwil in 1922 to become professor of Reformed Theology at the University of Gottingen and in 1925 transferred to the University of Munster in Westphalia.

The second of Barth's friends to be mentioned is Friedrich Gogarten, who differs from his three associates in that he is not a Swiss, but pure German. At present he is lecturer at the University of Jena and also pastor of a village church near by. He has written numerous articles and published several volumes.¹⁵ Some regard him as the profoundest thinker in the group, as superior to Barth both in critical insight and sobriety of judgment. As a writer, however, he is much less impressive. His style is involved, and it is often difficult to understand him. Along with Barth and Thurneysen he is a regular contributor to *Zwischen den Zeiten*.

The third and most independent of Barth's *Gesinnungsgenossen* is Emil Brunner, now professor in the University of Zurich. The fact that he, Barth, and Thurneysen are all Swiss, led at first to the designation of their type of theology as the Swiss theology," and the further fact that they were comparatively young men led to its designation as "the young Swiss theology." But these designations are less common now than they were two or three years ago. Brunner impresses one as the most scholarly of the "dialectic" quartette. He seems to be more at home in the field of philosophy than the others, has a more analytic and systematic mind, and is clearer and more precise in his definitions. These characteristics make him a better teacher, but they are also in danger of leading him into a premature dogmatism; and some of his friends, Barth included, seem to fear that he has already gone too far in that direction and to this extent departed from the pre"dialectic" gospel. But however true this may be of certain aspects of his teaching there can be no doubt that in his fundamental aim he is at one with Barth and that his bold and spirited advocacy of the common cause has done much to challenge the attention of the entire theological world.¹⁶

The new theology has met attack from almost every quarter; both Troeltsch and Harnack joined in it, and so have numberless lesser lights. It has been derided as 'a pathological phenomenon of the post-war period,' as "a kind of desperado theology," as "Marcionitic sheet lightning," as a "heap of fermenting ideas not yet clarified" and as a "futurist picture in which houses and trees tumble against each other."¹⁷

¹⁵*Die religiöse Entscheidung; Von Glauben und Offenbarung; Illusionen; Ich Glaube an den Dreieinigen Gott.*

¹⁶*Erlebnis, Erkenntnis und Glaube; Die Mystik und das Wort; Religionsphilosophie Evangelischer Theologie; Der Mittler.*

¹⁷See Max Strauch, *Die Theologie Karl Barth's* p. 1 f; John McConachie in the *Hibbert Journal*, 1927, p. 398.

But in spite of the attacks and the ridicule to which the movement has been subject, it has apparently gained steadily in influence. This indicates that it is not a mere flash in the pan, that it is not a freakish development, but that it stands logically and organically related to the religious thought of the day, especially that in Germany. Indeed, it may be regarded as the logical outcome of certain pronounced tendencies in recent German theology. There has, for instance, been a tendency to emphasize a "theocentric" as opposed to an "anthropocentric" theology, there has been a revival of "biblicism," and there has been a renewed alliance of theology with philosophical positivism or skepticism. One needs but recall the names of Eric Schaeder, Adolf Schlatter, Karl Heim and Paul Althaus to be reminded of the very effective expression which these tendencies have of late received. And it is these tendencies above all others that Barth represented. He has given to them the most extreme and radical formulation that they have yet received, and in so doing has carried with him much of the favor attaching to them in a more moderate form. Whether his theology is the *reductio ad absurdum* of these tendencies, or their justification, or possibly a perversion of them, is a question we need not raise. It is sufficient to have noted his positive and vital relation to them. This fact accounts in no small measure for the popularity of his theological writings.

We are, however, primarily concerned not with the outward fortunes and the general characteristics of the "dialectic" theology, but with its content and the question of its validity. To these more significant aspects of our subject we now turn. Barth himself has repeatedly disclaimed any intention of introducing a "new theology." His theology, so far as he has any that may be distinctly so called, consists, he tells us, "in one single point, and that is not . . . a *standpoint*, but a *mathematical* point on which one cannot stand, merely a *view-point*."¹⁸ He has no idea of creating a theological "school" or "system" that would be a rival to the "positive, liberal, Ritschlian or religio-historical theology." All he aims at is "a kind of marginal note and gloss" to these systems, a "corrective" of them, a "bit of spice" added to them. What he offers is simply an "introduction" to theology, "prolegomena," "preliminary observations," a "guide." But statements such as these should not be taken too seriously. Barth himself has recently said as much; and not only has he said it, he has just published the first volume of what is to be an extended work on "Christian Dogmatics," in which he is to give a systematic exposition of his theology,—a theology that is not merely "prolegomena," a kind of epistemological introduction to the

¹⁸Das Wort Gottes und die Theologie, p. 99.

subject, but complete in itself. The outlines of this theology he and his associates have already expounded, and with its main ideas we have now to deal in so far as they stand related to the ontological dialectic on which the system, as a whole, is based.

Revelation

We begin with the doctrine of revelation, not because it actually and logically comes first but because this position is formally assigned it. The new theology is a theology of the Word. It is biblicistic. This, as we have already noted, is one of the chief sources of its strength. It has appealed powerfully to that rich body of religious sentiment which in the course of the centuries has gathered about the Divine Word, and it has given very effective expression to the conviction that the sole hope of Protestantism lies in the revival of its traditional reverence for the Word of God. Indeed, this tendency in the Barthian theology has become distinctly more pronounced during the last two or three years—so much so that we are justified in speaking of a third stage in its development.¹⁹ The first centered about the idea of an eschatological crisis, the second about the idea of a dialectical crisis and the third about the idea of the Word. This third stage may be due to the influence of Emil Brunner, who, in particular, has concentrated attention upon the problem of revelation. But it is in line with a fundamental motive of the Barthian theology, and has just received its clearest and fullest expression in the volume by Barth referred to in the preceding paragraph. This volume, while introductory to a larger work of which it is to form a part, has its own distinctive title. It is called "The Doctrine of the Word of God." Here the eschatological and dialectical motives retreat into the background, and everything revolves around the idea of revelation. The Trinity, Incarnation, and other fundamental doctrines are not only accepted as revealed truths, but are interpreted as constituent elements in the conception of revelation itself.

It is the Reformation doctrine of revelation that Barth and his friends are professedly seeking to revive. But much of what they say sounds strangely different from that to which Protestant ears in the past have been accustomed. Emil Brunner, for instance, says that the Bible "is full of errors, contradictions, erroneous views of various human, natural historical relations. It contains numerous contradictions in the accounts of the life of Jesus, it is overgrown with legends even in the New Testament. Many of its parts are written in a very awkward, commonplace and even incorrect style."²⁰

¹⁹W. Schmidt, *Zeit und Ewigkeit*, pp. 57 ff.

²⁰*Religionsphilosophie evangelischer Theologie*, p. 79.

From this and many similar statements it is evident that he and his associates give free play to biblical criticism. But not only do they do that, they go a step further. They deny that a revelation in its usual historical sense is possible; their dialectic rules it out. Between time and eternity there is an antithesis so radical that nothing truly temporal or historical can be divine. Not only, then, is the Bible to a large extent a human book, as critics have rightly claimed, but as a *book* it is necessarily wholly a temporal and human product. There is nothing in it that can strictly be called divine. The Bible does not and cannot bridge the gulf between time and eternity, between the human and the divine. The temporal as such can at the best be only a parable of the eternal; and *every* temporal moment may be said to be such, it "bears unborn within itself the mystery of revelation."²¹ But revelation itself is not and cannot be a temporal fact. It is a divine act, a miracle, and as such comes "vertically from above." It may intersect the stream of time, but cannot become a part of it.

If this be true, however, and if the Bible belongs to the temporal flow, the question arises as to whether it does not sink to the level of other books and lose its unique significance. Barth, of course, never intended such a conclusion to be drawn, but it would seem, nevertheless, to be the logical consequence of his dialectic, and not a few of his utterances from the second period of his theological development might be quoted in support of it. In his third period, however, we have a new stress upon the unique and distinctive character of Scripture. Here a special revelational value is ascribed to the prophetic and apostolic word which lifts it above the common level of the relative and temporal. Indeed, Barth now distinguishes three forms of the Word of God.²² The first appears in Christian preaching, the second in the canonical Scriptures, and the third is superhistorical, the direct and immediate Word of God. Only the last is revelation in the strict sense of the term, but it is made real and living only through Scripture and preaching. The three forms of the Divine Word thus stand integrally related to each other. It is the same Divine Word in each case. Preaching derives the Word from Scripture and Scripture from revelation. Scripture thus stands in a special relation to the super-temporal revelation, and as such has a unique authority. It is an organ of the Divine, a bearer of the Word of God, as is no other book.

But what ground have we for asserting that the Bible sustains a positive and unique relation to the realm of the eternal and the absolute? What right have we to call it *the*

²¹*Roemerbrief*, 3rd ed., p. 481.

²²*Die Christliche Dogmatik* I, 37-47.

Word of God? To this Barth replies by saying that "the Bible is God's Word because it is."²³ "Revelation grounds itself," says Brunner "or it is no revelation."²⁴ Beyond the *Deus dixit* we cannot go; it is ultimate. It stands absolutely in its own right and in its essential nature is identical with the eternal Word of God made flesh in Christ Jesus. As such it is super-historical, but it is mediated to us through the Scriptures. They, consequently, are in a special sense organs of the Logos and by virtue of that fact must somehow share in the absoluteness and finality of the eternal Word of God. They are themselves an authoritative *Deus dixit*. Yet they are historical documents; and in view of that fact it is difficult to see how on the Barthian theory they can resist the disintegrating criticism to which all historical phenomena are subject and which would tend to dissipate their divine content. In other words, the conception of revelation just stated does not relieve us from the peril of historicism, the danger which Barth and his friends have especially sought to avoid.

On the other hand, if we conceive of the Scriptures as standing in such a loose and external relation to the Divine Word as to have no direct share in it, we virtually deny to them any revelational value. We might say with Barth that a king is a king no matter whether he be clothed in purple or in beggar's rags. But beggar's rags would conceal rather than reveal the royal character of the king who wore them; and so it would be with the Scriptures if their temporal nature prevented them from furnishing the eternal Logos with a fitting vestment. A real revelation requires an actual emergence of the eternal in the order of time or at least an adequate congruity between the temporal manifestation and the eternal reality. But such an emergence or degree of congruity is excluded if we hold to an endless qualitative difference between time and eternity. There is, therefore, a serious conflict between the later Barthian conception of Scripture and the principal of "dialectic."

This conflict seems to be recognized by Barth and his associates and to be dealt with in two different ways. First, they lay a great deal of stress on the miraculous character of revelation. God's speaking is miracle, pure and simple. It transcends the stream of time and of history, and hence cannot be directly perceived or grasped by the human mind; for human knowledge is limited to the temporal order. But here an unclearness develops. A miraculous event, as commonly understood, is perceptible by the senses and has its place in the world of time and space. Such an event, however, is at times spoken of by Barth and Brunner as an impossibil-

²³*Zwischen den Zeiten*, 1925, p. 124.

²⁴*Religionsphilosophie evangelischer Theologie*, p. 6.

ity. Time and history, they in this connection, apparently interpret in a naturalistic and necessitarian sense, looking upon all temporal and historical events as links in a causal chain. No miracle, they consequently say, can take place in the world as we see and experience it. Only in a super-temporal realm, a realm beyond all seeing and hearing, is miracle possible. But while miracle lies beyond all human perception, the very fact that it is miracle implies that it stands in some direct relation to human life. If it did not, it would not be miracle. Miracle has thus a double signification. It both is and is not related to the temporal order. In the former sense a connection is established with the traditional conception of a miraculous revelation, and in the latter sense a sop is thrown to the historical relativists. The ambiguity of the term "miracle" thus enables Barth to play both sides of the game and so to conceal in a measure the conflict between a real revelation and his own ontological dialectic.

Another and closely allied method of attaining the same end is the employment of paradox. This is a prominent characteristic of the "dialectic" school. To some extent it is no doubt a literary affectation. But as a method of exposition it is congenial to the dialectic system. It grows naturally out of the conception of truth or reality as lying midway between affirmation and negation and as suggested by both and contained in neither. It is also the form in which religious faith naturally expresses itself when allied with philosophical skepticism. This alliance implies that a thing may be religiously true and yet philosophically unwarranted. Such a standpoint readily gives rise to paradox. Revelation, for instance, may be said to be an "impossible possibility" or an "unreal reality," being possible and real in one sense and impossible and unreal in another. This style of expression is much affected by Barth and his friends. Aside from its literary catchiness and occasional brilliance it seems to provide a place for opposite views and seems also to overcome the opposition between them by pointing to a higher synthesis in which both views are in some sense justified. How this synthesis is effected we do not know. It is incomprehensible by us, but its validity is implied in the "dialectic" process of thought. We must then or at least may hold to a corresponding objective reality; and the only valid and effective way of speaking of this incomprehensible reality is by means of paradox.

In some such way as this Barth and Brunner seem to try to justify the contradiction that inheres in their conception of revelation. But the justification could hardly satisfy anyone but a confirmed irrationalist. If there is an endless qualitative difference between time and eternity, the temporality and non-temporality of revelation manifestly exclude each other and no amount of paradoxical hocus-pocus can remove

the intellectual scandal involved in the assertion of both. The authoritarian lamb cannot lie down in peace with the relativistic lion in any realm where reason continues to hold sway. If a divine revelation is real and has a definite content, the limits of temporality and relativity must somehow and somewhere be transcended. The gulf between time and eternity must be bridged. This, it is true, Barth and Brunner acknowledge. But they say that only God can bridge it, and in doing so he remains on the side of eternity. Man himself as a temporal being contributes nothing to it.

It would seem, however, that the bridge must at least have a buttress on the human side, and this buttress we are accustomed to call faith. But what is faith? Barth's and Brunner's answers to this question we must first consider before we can complete the discussion of their conception of revelation.

Faith

According to traditional Protestant teaching revelation is something objectively complete in itself, an event or series of events that belong to the past. It can be fully appropriated only by faith, but faith is not necessary to complete it. It is embodied in a divinely inspired book and as such has an independent and thinglike existence. Its innermost meaning, it is true, can be grasped only with the aid of the Divine Spirit; but grasped it can be by the human mind when thus aided; and the act by which it is truly grasped is called faith. Whether faith is at bottom a human or divine act or both, is a question which has been much discussed. But, however, that question may be answered, faith has commonly been interpreted in psychological terms and from this point of view has been regarded as complex in nature, consisting of volitional, emotional and cognitive elements. It has expressed itself in the form of submission, of assurance, and of belief or knowledge. One of these factors has usually been stressed more than the other two—people in that respect have differed—but all three have generally been looked upon as inherent in true Christian faith. Such faith implies revelation and is essential to its appropriation. But revelation does not require faith in order to complete itself; it found its completion in Scripture.

This traditional Protestant conception of revelation has been gradually undergoing a change since the time of Kant. The great Koenigsberger showed once for all that knowledge presupposes the creative activity of thought. Without such activity on the part of the recipient mind no communication of truth would be possible. Communication presupposes response. No revelation can, therefore, be purely objective. It becomes complete and so a real revelation only through the

answering and conditioning mind to which it is addressed. Translated into the language of theology this means, as Schleiermacher pointed out, that faith is essential to revelation. Not only is it necessary as the recipient of revelation, it is necessary as the means by which the content of revelation is determined. Revelation is communicated to us through the Bible but it is not identical with the Bible. What the revelational element in Scripture is, faith alone can sense and decide. Revelation thus loses its independent and static character and becomes correlative to faith. One implies the other, and each is determined in its nature and content by the other.

This modern conception of the relation of faith and revelation to each other is accepted by Barth and Brunner. But they depart from the modern and common view of faith in two important respects. First, they deny that faith can be construed in psychological terms. It is not knowledge, nor is it feeling, nor is it will. It is rather the negation of everything that is human. It is a "miracle," a "vacuum," a "leap into the void." These and many similar expressions are used to bring out the unique and super-psychological character of faith. Special animus is shown against Schleiermacher whom they refer to rather contemptuously as "the theological Paganini" because of his stress on feeling as the characteristic thing in faith. This animus appears particularly with Brunner²⁵ though the others share to a large degree his point of view. They look upon Schleiermacher as the source of most if not all evil in modern theology. His whole standpoint they reject as anthropocentric. But it is especially his pietistic view of faith to which they object. They reject, of course, also the rationalistic and purely volitional conceptions of faith. Faith, they hold, is something superhuman, divine. Barth even goes so far as to say that in faith it is God who hears.²⁶ Hearer and speaker thus become one, and revelation consists in God's conversing with himself. But this is to deny real revelation, for revelation must have a human objective. What Barth must then mean is that faith is the work of the Holy Spirit in those whom God has elected.

But this brings faith into the human sphere, and some sort of definite psychological or spiritual character must, it would seem, be ascribed to it. It is nothing "given," we are told; we do not even know when we have it; we can only "believe that we believe."²⁷ Still the effort is made, especially by Brunner, to bring faith into intelligible relation to known mental processes. An analogy is found in the objective reference of thought, its "intention" or meaning. The meaning as such is no part of the temporal flow, it is super-temporal;

²⁵*Die Mystik und das Wort.*

²⁶*Zwischen den Zeiten*, 1925, pp. 231, 241.

²⁷*Roemerbrief*, p. 128.

and so it is with faith. Faith, like thought, has its psychological accompaniments, but these accompaniments have nothing to do with the essential nature of either faith or thought. Both are above time and distinct from the psychical material that attends them. They both belong to "spirit," which is timeless; and both are self-evidencing. They differ in the objects to which they refer. The objective reference of faith is to God, and the act of reference has a divine source, as is not the case with rational thought, at least, not in the same direct way. But rational thought is nevertheless "spirit." Brunner even says that "reason is the divine part of man."²⁸ We thus have two forms of "spirit" or the Logos, one finite and the other absolute. Between these there is a certain antithesis, but there is also the suggestion of an underlying unity. In any case the antithesis is not by any means so sharp and absolute as that between "time and eternity." The latter allows of no mediation, while according to Brunner faith as a form of spirit is a connecting link between the human and the divine.

Faith conceived after the analogy of the objective reference in thought takes on an intellectual character, and in harmony with this Brunner interprets revelation as truth. The truth of revelation he distinguishes sharply from that of reason but he regards both as alike in this respect that they are super-historical, even anti-historical. Yet in spite of the anti- or super-historical character of revelation he insists on its "oneness."

Here it is that we come upon the second important difference between the "dialectic" and the common conception of faith. As ordinarily understood, the faith of today is separated by nineteen centuries from the historical revelation of God in Christ Jesus. The two stand in a causal and correlative relation to each other. Our faith owes its origin to the revelation in Scripture, and Scriptural revelation would today have no vitality or reality if there were no faith. But the two are widely separated in time, so that it would seem absurd and meaningless to assert their contemporaneity. Yet that is exactly what Brunner and his friends do. "There is," we are told, "no historical continuity of revelation but only a paradoxical unity of that which occurred only once with the present, the contemporaneity of faith with revelation. . . . The Word of God in Scripture is identical with the Word of God in the soul."²⁹ How this is possible we do not and cannot know. The identity of Scripture and Spirit is "paradoxical and unthinkable." But if so, why assert it? Brunner would say, Because it is the Reformation conception of faith,

²⁸*Philosophie und Offenbarung*, p. 39.

²⁹*Religionsphilosophie Evangelischer Theologie*, p. 9.

and then would add that it conserves what is true both in orthodoxy and rationalism. It combines the authority of a miraculous *Deus dixit* with a timeless truth which is self-evidencing. But this combination is held together by no cement, logical or otherwise. It is a house divided against itself and cannot stand. Either traditional authoritarianism will eventually get the upper hand or some form of immediacy, rationalistic or mystical. The human mind cannot permanently remain perched on a paradox.

The difficulty with the Barthian conception of revelation and faith is that it owes its origin to a philosophy alien to that of Scripture. The "endless qualitative difference" between time and eternity is no teaching of the Apostle Paul. Barth read the idea into the Pauline epistles and then deduced his view of revelation from it. It was not then revelation that gave him his cosmological dualism, but his dualism that gave him his theory of revelation. This dualism, as we have already pointed out, had various sources, but in the exposition of it by Barth and Brunner it is closely linked up with the logistic neo-Kantianism of Herrmann Cohen. Brunner, in particular, employs the latter in the development of his doctrine of faith. This type of philosophy is positivistic and in that respect a natural foil to a super-naturalistic theology. But the spirit of the two is antagonistic, one to the other. It is this fact that gives rise to the paradoxical and contradictory character of the Barthian theology. Its dialectic, as Harnack says, "leads us along an invisible ledge between absolute religious skepticism and naïve biblicism."³⁰ This will be still further illustrated by its doctrine of God, man and Christ.

God

Barth and his associates put God most emphatically at the centre of their theology. Indeed, they aim to make their theology more completely and absolutely theocentric than has ever been done before. This is one of their chief merits, that they have taken the thought of God seriously and have given to it that overshadowing significance which properly belongs to it in religion but which it has been in danger of losing. The motto of their entire theology might be said to be *Deo soli gloria*.

But what do they mean by God? So many paradoxical and contradictory things are said about him that at first one is puzzled to know what they do mean. It is, however, clear that they start with an idea of God derived from, or, rather, suggested by a positivistic and relativistic philosophy. They are, as already stated, neo-Kantians of the Marburg type. Knowledge for them is restricted to the phenomenal or temporal

³⁰*Die Christliche Welt*, 1923, Col. 105.

order. This order points to an eternal being beyond itself but only points toward it or him. The Eternal remains of necessity unknown. He is the Absolute, out of all relations, and hence beyond the reach of human knowledge. We are justified in asserting his existence, but beyond that we may not go. He is "known as the Unknown," and only so known. Even revelation does not remove the cloud that surrounds him. "God is incomprehensible," says Barth,³¹ "even in his revelation, yes, precisely in his revelation." He is and ever remains *Deus absconditus*. Revelation does not rob him of that character. But if so, what is the value of revelation? A revelation that does not reveal would seem to be a contradiction in itself.

The difficulty at this point is partly removed by the sharp distinction drawn between knowledge and faith. Faith is not knowledge; in one sense it is the negation of knowledge. It is because knowledge is impossible that faith is necessary. Revelation, therefore, which is addressed to faith, does not increase knowledge. Faith is even defined as "respect for the divine Incognito." It does not seek to unveil the veiled. In the very presence of revelation we may, therefore, say that we do not know God.

But this is only half the story. Faith may have its negative but it also has its positive side. It may imply more or less of agnosticism, but it also implies knowledge. God may, in a certain sense, be to us the Unknown, but faith nevertheless apprehends him as the Creator, Judge, and Redeemer of the world. This Barth admits and affirms. He could not do otherwise and remain a Christian. The question, consequently, arises as to what is to be done with this positive content of faith. How is a place to be found for it alongside of such an extreme agnosticism as Barth represents?

He himself seems to handle the problem in two different ways. First, he interprets creation, judgment, and redemption, so far as possible, in the light of his own ontological dialectic. God, he tells us, has created the world and has left his tracks there, but they are "the tracks of an Unknown." He is in no sense immanent in the world, nor is the world a reflection of his power and character as we would expect it to be, if it were his work. The doctrine of creation has, therefore, no special significance for Barth. He hardly does more than give formal assent to it. For him the world is a fallen world. It has lost the marks of the divine handiwork. It is so completely woven of the warp and woof of time as to be antithetical to Deity rather than in any sense an image of him.

This antithesis of the world to God brings out the thought

³¹*Zwischen den Zeiten*, 1925, p. 121.

of the divine judgment, but judgment, as conceived by Barth, is abstract and metaphysical rather than concrete and ethical. It is a judgment which eternity passes upon time, rather than a judgment passed by a righteous Judge upon a wilful misdoer. What brings condemnation upon the world is its finitude rather than its moral perversity. Over against the world of time stands eternity as a limit, a threat, a crisis, as death. "Death," says Barth, "is the only genuine revelation of God in history." But if so, what becomes of the personal, righteous Ruler of the world and the Redeemer of mankind? He loses all definiteness of character and is merged in an abstract and incomprehensible eternity. What he really is we do not know. All we know, as Barth says, is "that God is he whom we do not know." The Barthian theology of revelation becomes thus a theology of the Unknown God. The attributes of righteousness and love are ascribed to him, but they are so submerged in the all-pervading thought of a cosmological crisis that their biblical lineaments are often lost to view.

This, of course, was not Barth's aim. He has sought to revive the idea of the divine sovereignty, and has expressed it with tremendous energy in an extreme form. In doing so he has availed himself of an agnostic type of philosophy, but this does not mean that he himself is an agnostic with reference to the divine love and righteousness. He thinks that these attributes have of late been stressed in a one-sided way, and hence his tendency has been to subordinate them in an equally one-sided way to the thought of the absolute and incomprehensible sovereignty of God. But he has had no intention of obliterating or obscuring them. That he has seemed to do so has grown out of the effort to bring his theology into harmony with his philosophical skepticism.

There is, however, another method that he has adopted in his attempt to adjust his theology to its agnostic setting. This is the dialectic method in the logical sense of the term. According to the dialectic logic the negative and the positive imply each other. We cannot define existence without reference to non-existence nor non-existence without reference to existence. Now Barth says it is so also with judgment and grace. The divine No implies the divine Yes, and the divine Yes the divine No. But here we are unable to follow Barth. The divine doom does not necessarily carry with it the divine favor nor the divine favor the divine doom. Logically, they may suggest each other, but as ethical acts they are distinct. We cannot deduce the divine love from the divine judgment, and still less can we deduce it from the bare idea of eternity. The element of truth in Barth's contention is this, that the consciousness of sin and judgment, as Schleiermacher pointed out, is relative to that of grace. But this is merely a psychological fact, not a logical or ontological relation.

We must then pronounce Barth's attempted synthesis of the biblical idea of God with the great Unknown of philosophical agnosticism as unsuccessful. God cannot be known at one and the same time both as absolutely unknown and as the God of grace and truth, and no logical dialectic can make such a contradictory affirmation tolerable to the human mind.

Man

Barth's doctrine of man is the correlate of his doctrine of God. Both are determined by the assumed "endless qualitative difference between time and eternity," and both are involved in difficulties and inconsistencies because of the effort to combine this fundamental and radical dualism with biblical teaching. Three points in particular may be noted in connection with the "dialectic" conception of man.

First, sinfulness is attributed to all men, and it is attributed to them not because of the offenses which they have actually committed but because of their finitude, because they are temporal beings. This is a "fallen" world, and it is such because it is a temporal as distinguished from an eternal world. How it "fell" we do not know. The biblical story is a myth. But the fact of a fall is one involved in the nature of time: Between time and eternity, between man and God, there is a death-line, a "live" wire that stands as a perpetual threat to any human being who approaches it. All that is temporal is under the doom of the eternal; and this means that all men are "children of wrath." They are sinners, and sinners they must remain so long as they are men. Sin is of the essence of human nature.

But if so, sin would seem to lose its ethical character. It may manifest itself in a "lack of reverence" and in "disobedience," but in its essential nature it becomes something sub-ethical, a condition of our existence rather than a state of our will. In other words, the antithesis between man and God is primarily metaphysical, not ethical. But this is a Greek, not a Hebrew conception. Barth's attempt to read it into the Pauline epistles and into Scripture in general must be pronounced a failure. However deeply sin may be ingrained in human nature according to biblical teaching, it is never identified with human finitude. Such a metaphysical dualism is excluded by the doctrine of creation.

A second point to be noted in Barth's anthropology is his denial of freedom. This denial has a double source, one religious, the other philosophical. The religious source is Calvinism. Barth is a Calvinist. A hyper-Calvinist he might be called. He holds to double predestination. He regards God as so absolutely sovereign that no real human initiative is possible. The only good thing possible to man is faith, and faith is a divine, not a human, act. So far as man is con-

cerned faith denotes pure passivity, emptiness, a vacuum. Man himself has no capacity for God: *finitum non capax infiniti*. Everything in man is dependent on God. This view has a manifest basis in *one* phase of religious feeling, and with Barth this one phase overshadows all others.

The philosophical source of his denial of human freedom is found in neo-Kantianism. According to Cohen and Natorp, who in this respect follow Kant, the causal principle is all-pervasive in the phenomenal world. Every event in space or time is determined by its relation to other events. Psychological events are as completely determined by their causal connections as are physical events. There can, therefore, be no human freedom in the commonly accepted sense of the term. Man, as an empirical being, is effect, not cause.

But if this be so, the logical result would be religious nihilism. Both reason and conscience would be involved in disaster. Only in freedom can a rational basis be found for the ideals of life. Naturalistic necessitarianism would mean the end of religious faith. Neither paradox nor an irrational dialectic can prevent its having such a result.

A third point of difficulty in Barth's conception of man has to do with the relation of the empirical or temporal ego to the believing ego, the ego of eternal life. For he holds firmly to the latter. His is a *Jenseitigkeits Theologie*. He does not mean to abate a jot or tittle the reality of the life hereafter. But if there is an absolute qualitative difference between time and eternity, if the temporal and empirical self is doomed to complete extinction, if the new ego is something totally different from the old,³² how are we to conceive of the connection between them, what is the basis of any continuity of consciousness, what value and content are we to ascribe to the life to come from the standpoint of the life that now is? To these questions Barth and his friends have no answer. To them it is all "miracle" in the sense that no rational construction of the belief is possible. The life hereafter is a logically contradictory conception. We believe it "because it is absurd."

Christ

In the field of Christology the difficulties inherent in the dialectic theology are perhaps still more evident. Barth and his friends are Christo-centric in their interest. To them Christ is the Word of God. The incarnation, atonement, and resurrection are points of fundamental importance in their theology. But how are these doctrines to be harmonized with the endless qualitative difference between time and eternity?

The only way to do this, manifestly, is to distinguish

³²*Roemerbrief*, pp. 136, 139, 182 f, etc.

sharply between Jesus and Christ; and this the Barthians do. Jesus, as a man, is for them merely a temporal being, a "sinner" like other men. He stands under the doom of death. Whether the facts of his life are correctly recorded in the gospels is not a matter of any importance. Certainty here is impossible. His earthly career in any case was an "historical fiasco,"³³ a failure. Christ, "according to the flesh," means very little to us. He was not "the Word of God," but only an indirect medium of revelation like the rest of us. We are not then to think of him as a hero or a genius or "an earnest public man, almost as earnest as a preacher" (Kierkegaard). His significance was negative and consisted simply in the fact that his life pointed toward an Unknown, a super-historical being. In this higher imperceptible realm lies the whole value of the Gospel and the Gospel-story. Not even the resurrection of Christ is an historical datum. As an event of history it is open to question and can be dissolved away into myth. The real resurrection lies beyond time and space. It is an event to which the Gospel-narratives in parabolic fashion refer, but which is itself inaccessible to sense. It appertains, in a word, to the eternal Christ rather than the historical Jesus.

But if so, does not Jesus become a mere symbol of the truth instead of the truth itself? And does not this mean a return to the older rationalistic standpoint? Does it not mean that it is a matter of indifference whether Jesus ever lived? Adam, according to Barth,³⁴ is a symbol of the divine No, regardless of whether he ever lived or not; and if so, it would seem that Jesus also might be the symbol of the divine Yes, regardless of the question of his historicity. But this is a conclusion which Barth emphatically repudiates. Jesus is for him an historical reality and a reality of supreme importance. In him two worlds meet. He is the point of intersection between the temporal and the eternal, the known and the unknown. Through him God reveals himself. Revelation belongs, therefore, to a definite period of time, to the years 1-30 A.D.³⁵ The resurrection as a recognized event took place "before the gates of Jerusalem in the year 30." "In the resurrection," says Barth, "the new world of the Holy Spirit touches the old world of the flesh. But it touches it as a tangent does a circle, without touching it, and by virtue of the very fact that it does *not* touch it, it touches it as its limit, as a *new world*."³⁶

³³E. Brunner, *Mystic und das Wort*, p. 226.

³⁴*Roemerbrief*, pp. 151, 158.

³⁵*Ibid.* p. 7.

³⁶*Roemerbrief*, p. 8. The most adequate and self-consistent exposition of the "dialectic" christology is to be found in Brunner's "*Der Mittler*," where a more negative attitude is taken toward such questions as the Virgin birth and the bodily resurrection of Jesus than in Barth's latest book.

Exactly what he means by this is not clear. But it would seem that he means that the eternal resurrection-life is revealed in the bodily resurrection of Jesus in some such way as the invisible grace of God is made visible in Jesus' death. The implication would then be that the bodily resurrection of Jesus is as historically real as his death, and that both are essential to the revelation of God. But if so, what becomes of Barth's historical relativism, of his indifference to biblical criticism? It is evident that we have here another instance of his attempt to combine two irreconcilable standpoints. If we hold strictly to the endless qualitative difference between time and eternity with its implied philosophical agnosticism, Jesus was at the most a symbol, nothing more. If we hold to historic Christianity, he stood in a real and unique relation to Christ the eternal Logos. The first of these views makes his historical reality a matter of indifference, the second makes it essential to the Christian faith. Between them we must choose. We cannot hold to both, as Barth seems to, without complete intellectual befuddlement.

Conclusion.

What are we now to say of this new theology as a whole? The chief objections to it we have already noted. Its *proton pseudos* is its ontological dialectic, its fundamental dualism between time and eternity or between man and God. This dualism is based on the supposed logical antithesis between the two terms. But the relation of God to the world is not logical; it is volitional. Creation binds the two together and makes forever impossible an absolute antithesis between them except on the assumption of a "fall" more abysmal than any that Christian thought could tolerate. There is, it is true, in Christian feeling a sense of sinfulness that raises a barrier between the soul and God, but this feeling is offset by the belief in providence and by an ennobling sense of moral responsibility that tends to re-establish the broken unity. In any case it is wholly unwarranted to take the Christian consciousness of sin and translate it into an ontological dualism.

A second objection to the Barthian theology is to be found in its alliance with philosophical positivism or skepticism. This alliance may seem to accentuate the need of a divine revelation and so augment reverence for the Word of God; but it is only a half-hearted adherence to this type of philosophy that has such an effect. The doctrine of relativism, logically carried out, undermines faith as completely as it does reason. If reason is not trustworthy beyond the phenomenal realm, there is no valid ground for holding that "faith" is. The two stand or fall together. A theology that feeds on philosophical skepticism will perish thereby.

A third objection to the dialectic theology is the deep inner

discord that runs through the whole system. The word "dialectic" suggests it. This discord grows out of the effort to combine the Reformation type of Protestantism with the current positivistic philosophy. The two refuse to coalesce. One contradicts the other, and so a perpetual see-saw of thesis and antithesis, of Yes and No, results. Paradox follows paradox in an endless series. The mind comes to no rest. Not even faith attains security. It has no anchor; it swings free. It is a leap over a precipice, and leaves its subject insecurely suspended above a yawning abyss. This view of faith and of reason has no doubt its challenging feature, but it is hardly a view that in the long run can be said to be conducive to mental or spiritual health. Truth does not lie in contradiction nor faith in insecurity. A unity, in which both head and heart can find anchorage, must be the goal of all serious intellectual and religious endeavor.

In the fourth place it may be justly urged against the new theology that much of its polemic is directed against unreal abstractions and that its present vogue is due in no small measure to the ambiguity of its terms or the unusual sense in which they are employed. Take, for instance, the terms "time," "history," "experience," "religion." "Time" and "history" are interpreted in a naturalistic and necessitarian sense, and as such are justly condemned as devoid of spiritual content. "Experience" and "religion" are interpreted as purely human phenomena and so come under condemnation as exclusive of the divine. But these abstract meanings are not the ones commonly ascribed to these terms. The same is also to be said of the "dialectic" interpretation of such terms as "revelation," "miracle," "resurrection," and "atonement;" it differs materially from the traditional interpretation. Yet the two are not always sharply distinguished. The result is a great deal of unclearness and confusion of thought; and the system actually seems to thrive on this confusion. What Trendelenberg said of metaphysics in general might aptly be applied to much of the dialectic theology. It is "a systematic misuse of a terminology expressly invented for that purpose."

But while serious and, indeed, decisive theoretical considerations may thus be urged against the theology of crisis, there are elements of strength in it. It has a message, a number of very important messages, for our day. First, it is a summons to us to take the thought of God seriously, to think through its implications more fully than we have. Never, I suppose, has this need been brought home to theologians more insistently than by the Barthian school. As a protest against the superficial secular humanism of the day they have rendered a valuable service.

Secondly, their theology is a summons to us to give greater heed to the sovereign and incomprehensible aspects of the di-

vine nature. God is love, but he is also the Veiled Being, before whom we need to stand in awe and reverence. This lesson our age needs to learn.

Again, the theology of crisis brings home to us the seriousness of the thought of human destiny and the imminence of this impending event. It thus restores to religion something of its lost power. The lightning of heaven, which in the past had been changed into a domestic slow combustion stove, begins again to flash across our sky.

In the fourth place, the dialectic theology is a vigorous protest against the pride and presumption of the modern man. The protest goes too far. It humiliates man beyond what either reason or faith can tolerate, but it nevertheless has its value as a corrective of the self-deification, into which the modern man has fallen.

Finally, our new theology has rendered an important service by bringing the idea of revelation back into the centre of theological interest and by summoning the church to a deeper and more reverent study of the Word of God.

These services, it may be noted, are all practical. It is in this field, in my opinion, that the chief significance of the Barthian theology lies. Barth will hardly become another Schleiermacher, inaugurating a new theological era, as some of his admiring friends predict. But he has already brought into theology a new note of religious earnestness. He speaks, it is true, a different language from that to which we have been accustomed. His ideas and modes of thought seem often strange and puzzling. But however unclear, inconsistent, paradoxical, and even erroneous his utterances may be, they clothe a message of prophetic power. They bring home to people the reality of the divine. It is this fact, quite as much as the novel and revolutionary character of their theological reconstruction, that has given to Barth and his associates their present conspicuous place in the theological world.

THE CORRELATION OF COLLEGE AND SEMINARY COURSES

PRESIDENT FREDERICK CARL EISELEN,
Garrett Biblical Institute.

In his annual report, submitted in 1926, Dean Hawkes, of Columbia College, touched upon one phase of the subject under discussion in these words: "It is curious that the profession in the interest of which most of the colleges in this country were founded is the only important one that does not receive recognition in our curriculum. We hear about the pre-law, the pre-medical, the pre-engineering, the pre-business, the pre-architecture, the pre-journalism student, but never a word about the pre-theological student. A great deal of attention has been paid to the proper preliminary course for the prospective lawyer or physician, but little for the clergyman." Then, after outlining a pre-theological course, worked out by Columbia College in co-operation with Union Theological Seminary, he concludes this part of his report with this paragraph: "The organization of this combined course, by means of which a student may count the first year in the Seminary as his senior year, places the profession of the clergy on the same academic plane as that of the lawyer, the engineer or the physician. Candidates for this course will cultivate the same group consciousness that has grown up among the pre-medical students, and the profession will tend to gain prestige as one of the fields to which a normal young man should give consideration in selecting his life work, by being included in the same category with the other professional groups."

The Conference of Theological seminaries has had the general subject under consideration since its organization; and at the meeting held in Princeton in August, 1920, "a committee was appointed to inquire what suggestions might be made as to guidance of the studies of men in college who look forward to the work of the ministry." This committee presented a report at the meeting held in Toronto in 1922, in the form of a paper submitted by Professor E. C. Moore, which, in an exceedingly suggestive way, dealt, not so much with specific proposals as with certain fundamental principles upon which any proposed program must be based.

In recent years increasing attention has been given by various agencies and many individuals to a better correlation of college and seminary courses. My own interest goes back a good many years, for as early as 1911 I presented a discussion of the subject before the Educational Association of the Methodist Episcopal Church; and since then I have had occasion to return to it on numerous occasions; and I assume that it is because of this interest that I have been asked to

discuss the question in this conference. In order to make my position clear, I may say that I shall treat the subject entirely from the point of view of ministerial efficiency as understood by the writer, and on the basis of actual conditions as he has met them during more than twenty-five years of actual experience with seminary students. Again, the views expressed are my own personal views; I do not claim to represent in any sense the consensus of educators in the field of theology. However, the views set forth are the outgrowth of a long experience as registrar, dean and president. Once more, the subject is presented for discussion. True, the writer has ideas and even convictions on the subject; but any conclusion reached by the conference should follow a full and free discussion of every aspect of the question.

Following these preliminary remarks we may now enter upon a consideration of the question as stated in the program—the correlation of college and seminary courses. In passing, let us remember that the question before us is only one phase of the more general problem of the proper adjustment of the college course to the professional course, or of the professional course to the college course; only in the case of professional schools other than theological seminaries the question has already assumed a somewhat clearly defined form, namely, *How much credit is to be allowed by the colleges for work done in the professional schools?* The maximum amount of credit thus accepted is fixed by most colleges at thirty semester hours, or, one full year's work.

Any attempts to bring about a proper correlation of college and seminary courses must first of all give attention to the aims of the college course on the one hand, and to those of the seminary course on the other. There was a time when the chief function of the college was to train ministers, when the faculty consisted largely of men with pastoral experience. Under such conditions the college could do for the ministerial candidate what the present-day college with its broader functions and a different type of faculty may find impossible to do. The primary aim of the college has been defined as the development of personality or character, that of the graduate school of research as knowledge, and that of the professional school as skill in the application of both character and knowledge. Undoubtedly, these definitions, when narrowly interpreted, fail to express the whole truth. Nevertheless, the primary aim of the college, it seems to me, should still be to assist the students to develop strong, noble, well-rounded personalities, and to inspire them to throw their best selves into the service of their fellows. Naturally, in the course of such development and training the student will learn, in a measure, at least, how to make use of his new and growing powers, but it is not the aim of the college to furnish him the detailed pro-

professional training which will enable him to meet the demands of the several professions.

What now is the aim of the theological seminary? Whatever differences may exist between the ministry and the professions of law, medicine, and others, the ministry has become in a real sense a profession, and the theological seminary is, or should be, a professional school as truly as is the law school or the medical school. The aim of the theological seminary, therefore, cannot be the same as that of the college or of the non-professional graduate school. Confining ourselves to essentials, the definitions referred to may still be accepted; the ultimate goal of the college is the *right kind of personality*, the ultimate goal of the professional school is *skill in the application of both personality and knowledge*. True, the professional school cannot afford to overlook the need of a strong, well-rounded personality and character; for the professional man, be he lawyer, doctor, or minister, should, first of all, be a man of high and noble character. Nor can it afford to minimize the importance of knowledge. There is teaching of science in every great medical school, but scientific knowledge as such is not the goal. The ultimate aim of the medical school is the training of the general practitioner, of the man who can prevent and cure disease, who can perform delicate and difficult operations for the saving of men's lives.

In a similar manner, the ultimate aim of the theological seminary, whatever emphasis it may place upon personality or knowledge—and these cannot be over-emphasized—should be the training of the student in the skillful use of all he is and all he knows in and for the Kingdom of God. It is not the primary business of the theological school to prepare men to occupy professorial chairs, for the average theological student is not an embryonic professor of theology. Opportunity for specialization may and should be offered, but the chief duty of the theological school is to train skillful physicians of the soul, faithful ambassadors of Jesus Christ, courageous captains of the Lord's host, sympathetic shepherds of the flock of Christ.

It is highly important that the seminary recognize the rightful place of the college in the education of the minister. It is equally important that the college recognize the rightful place of the seminary. In other words, it is not the theological seminary alone, or the college alone, that contributes to the training of the prospective minister. College and seminary must co-operate in preparing him for his life work; and seven years—a full college course and a full seminary course—surely is not too long a time to spend in preparing for the difficult tasks of the modern minister.

1. It is at this point that the first question as to correlation arises: Is it desirable to shorten the seminary course

through the acceptance by the seminary of college credits in theological or semi-theological subjects? Many who recognize the importance of adequate professional training also for various reasons favor a shortening of the time devoted to preparation for the professions, including the ministry. As a consequence a variety of combination courses have been provided. Looking over the catalogue of one university I find the following possible combinations suggested: Three years of college followed by the medical course; three years of college followed by the law course; three years of college followed by the dental course; two years of college followed by a course in business administration. In all these cases there is a saving of one year's time in securing the college degree and the professional degree. The same question of saving time is raised by college men looking forward to the ministry. But while practical uniformity has been attained in the matter of combination courses in other professions, there is a decided lack of uniformity in the case of the ministry. The form in which the issue presents itself most commonly to the theological seminaries is this: The student arrives at the theological school with his diploma, after a four years' college course. During the four years he has taken courses in Bible, Religion, Religious Education and similar subjects. The regular seminary course is three years. He wants to complete his preparation in the shortest possible time. What credits can the seminary accept for theological or semi-theological studies pursued in college? In other words, *the attempt is made to save time by shortening the theological course to two years.*

The speaker believes that from the standpoint of ministerial efficiency this is not a wise kind of correlation: (1) It is impossible for any student adequately to cover the studies which are fundamental and essential in the curriculum of a seminary awake to present-day needs, in less than three years. A half century ago the theological curriculum recognized five departments of study, Hebrew and the Old Testament, Greek and the New Testament, Systematic Theology, Church History and Practical Theology. These seemed to meet all the needs of the ministers and of the people of that day. All of these studies are fundamental, and they still have a rightful place in the theological curriculum, either as required studies or as electives. But in order to meet the changed conditions and the demands upon the modern minister, the seminary curriculum has been enlarged and enriched by courses like these (the list is not meant to be exhaustive):—Social Relations in City and Country (including clinical or laboratory work), Religious Education (including the application of Psychology to the Religious Life), Modern Methods of Evangelism, Ethics, The Comparative Study of Religions (includ-

ing the History and Philosophy of Religion), and such other studies as may help the minister to know Christianity, the men to whom he seeks to minister and how to apply Christianity to life in all its complex interests and relations.

Confronted by the problem of finding room for all these studies, it would seem that the seminaries should welcome the offering of theological courses in college for which credit might be allowed in the theological schools. And some there are who look in this direction for a more satisfactory correlation between the college course and the seminary course. If the question were merely, or even chiefly, a question of time, this scheme might be welcomed; but to the speaker it seems that other considerations deserve serious attention. Any scheme which involves the shortening of the course in the theological seminary will seriously interfere with the effectiveness of ministerial training. If any change in the length of the seminary course is considered, it should be in the direction of lengthening instead of shortening the course.

(2) Another objection to the substitution of college studies for courses which should be taken in the seminary may be stated in the form of a question. Is it possible to consider a college study in a theological or semi-theological subject the equivalent of a seminary study in which the same general subject is discussed? To illustrate: A study of Society and its problems has a proper place in the college curriculum. I find, for instance, in a college catalogue, this outline of a course:—"Sociology, Socialism, and Social Reform. The general principles of social evolution and progress, with particular reference to social laws. A critical study of the principles of socialism and the socialistic movement, the single tax, co-operation and profit-sharing." Surely such a course has a rightful place in the college curriculum, and the minister of the twentieth century needs the knowledge furnished by it; and yet the question may well be raised whether the theological school should consider such a course the equivalent of a course covering the same general subject in the theological curriculum. The reason for this question is obvious. Perhaps in nine cases out of ten the approach to the subject will not be the same in the two institutions. This is clearly illustrated by a statement taken from the catalogue of a theological seminary: "Social Philosophy. Under this the aim is (1) to acquaint the student with the elements of the science. (2) Then advance to the study of special and present social problems, and (3) to show the relation of Christian teaching and the Church to these social conditions. The whole is approached from the standpoint of the working church. Emphasis, therefore, is placed upon the religious and ethical factors in civilization as distinguished from the merely economical and bio-

logical, and particularly upon the relation of the Gospel to the solution of social and industrial problems."

The latter part of this statement sets forth the task of the theological seminary, and to it the seminary should give its attention. The first part infringes upon the sphere of the college. Unfortunately, however, the seminaries are compelled to do this elementary work, because so many students come from college to seminary without even an elementary knowledge of the subject. Similarly, the college curriculum should include courses in Bible, Ethics, and related subjects, but if brought into harmony with the general aim of the college course, the approach to them will differ from that of the theological school; because in one the aim is primarily cultural, in the other, professional. In other words, the college study might well serve as a preparation for the theological study, but should not be regarded as an equivalent or substitute.

(3) Moreover, the average college student is not sufficiently developed to pursue with greatest profit theological studies while he is pursuing his college course. He needs the mental discipline furnished by the college course to prepare him for the seminary studies. He needs the non-theological studies which are a part of the normal college curriculum as a basis for the more technical professional training in the seminary.

Add to these considerations the lack in the ordinary college of library equipment and of clinical facilities, which are important elements in the theological course, and the question inevitably arises, should the giving of theological courses in colleges be encouraged if we seek the highest efficiency in the ministry? Should the proper correlation be sought on the basis of the acceptance by the seminaries of college credit for studies which rightfully belong to the theological curriculum?

Long continued experience has convinced me that as long as in a consideration of correlation we confine ourselves to a discussion of the question of credits, substituting college credits for seminary requirements, we do not begin to touch the heart of the matter. The best interests of the ministry and of the church demand that students who take a theological course should be required to spend at least three years under the immediate direction of the seminary.

2. A second suggestion would make the combination course consist of three years in college and three years in the seminary; a total of six years for the Arts and Divinity degrees. This is the correlation worked out by Columbia College and Union Theological Seminary. The present writer believes that normally a theological student should be held to a four years' course in college and a three year's course in the seminary. I thoroughly agree with the late President Plantz, when he writes: "I have not very much interest in shortening the

training of men for the ministry. Those who have taken the college and seminary courses are poorly enough prepared for their work, and most of them get into the calling sufficiently young." But whatever ideal we may cherish, pressure to shorten the time spent in preparation for the ministry comes—in addition to financial pressure—from at least two directions: (1) There is an increasingly urgent demand for men with both college and seminary training; (2) Generally speaking, the average age of college students looking forward to the ministry is higher than is the case with men planning to enter other professions. As a result, pressure is brought upon men to hasten their education, and thus be ready for appointments or calls.

All this simply means that, whether we like it or not, we must face the demand for a combination college and seminary course which will enable students to save time. The only question is—What is to be the nature of the combination course? As already pointed out, the shortening of the seminary course, involving a substitution of college credit for seminary requirements, is open to serious objections. To me it seems that, where a combination course becomes necessary, the agreements already reached between colleges and other professional schools point the way. In general, this means that three years in college and three years in a seminary may bring to a student both the college and the seminary degree.

3. But whether we insist on a seven or a six years' college and seminary course, unless the correlation goes beyond the matter of time, it may prove a detriment rather than a blessing: It must include the contents of the course outlined for the prospective minister in college and seminary: (1) It may be well for the seminaries to inquire, whether all the studies now included in the seminary curriculum rightfully belong there, or whether some of them are not in the nature of college studies. Do the elements of Greek and Hebrew occupy a rightful place in the regular theological curriculum? To what extent should rhetoric, composition, elocution, and similar studies be retained as a part of the regular seminary curriculum? The theological seminaries may well scrutinize their courses of study, exclude from them studies which are not professional, in order to make room for others which are essential for the proper equipment of the modern minister.

(2) As a part of any program of correlation more attention should be given, both by seminaries and colleges, to studies pursued by candidates for the ministry during their college course; for no one who has to do with theological students can fail to discover deficiencies in many men coming from colleges to seminaries, deficiencies which might have been avoided by a proper selection of studies during the college course. What I mean to say is, that the prospective minister,

even during his college course, needs definite guidance in the selection of his studies, so that he may escape the peril of neglecting courses that may be absolutely essential, or, at least, highly important as a preparation for his professional course. The best interests of the prospective minister may demand the appointment of some one competent person as the adviser for pre-theological students, just as there are advisers for pre-medical and pre-legal students.

(3) But it may be necessary to go even further. A careful study should be made of the fundamental needs of the modern minister. On the basis of such study a comprehensive curriculum should be worked out, covering both the college and the seminary course. Such a curriculum should be worked out not by the seminaries alone, or by the colleges alone, but by representatives of both, with the assistance of men representing the practical work of the ministry. While proper provision should be made for a considerable degree of flexibility, making use of the group system and general electives, the results of such study would serve as a guide to prospective ministers; and if the adviser system is judiciously used, a practical correlation of seminary and college studies would be achieved.

It is not my purpose, at this time, to discuss the contents of the theological course as such; but I do wish to present for consideration some tentative suggestions as to the contents of a pre-theological college course. The minister's training, as has been pointed out, has two sides. He must have definite professional training like the lawyer and physician; and he needs, perhaps, more than any other professional man, what may be called thorough and comprehensive cultural training. In a broad sense even the latter has a professional significance, for it bears vitally upon the work of the minister. Now, the college is not intended to give a man his professional training. Too many ministerial students in the past have said: I must know the Bible, Religious Education and related subjects; therefore I will take every course in this field offered in college. This is a mistake. True, every student should take some courses in these fields during his college days, for they have distinct cultural value; but the real training in biblical, theological and ministerial fields should come in the seminary, where such technical courses are offered primarily for ministers and on a graduate basis. The time of the pre-theological student in college is needed for courses which the seminary cannot and should not give.

The prospective minister needs a knowledge of history to give him perspective, breadth of outlook, and the knowledge of the experiences of the past, without which no man can understand the present. He should study literature, above all, that in his own tongue, for through it comes the wealth of

truth and beauty and the great portrayals and interpretations of life. He should study science, not only that he may know the new universe which it so wonderfully reveals, but that he may appreciate the point of view, the temper and the method for which science stands. Sociology, politics and economics are needed as an introduction to the world of human life in the important associations of industry, the state and other social relations. Religion has something to say about this social life of men; indeed, its guidance is needed nowhere else today so urgently as here. And, surely, the minister must know this life if he wants to bring the great Christian principles to bear upon it. Philosophy, psychology and ethics come even closer to the interests of religion.

Looking at the course purely from the cultural point of view these studies demand a hearing. When the professional point of view is added the importance of these as well as some other studies to the future minister can hardly be over-estimated. There should be added, for instance, thorough training in the English language; for that is a necessary tool of the preacher. He must learn to appreciate it as used by the masters; and he himself must master it in writing and speaking. Again, professionally speaking, philosophy, psychology, education, and ethics, especially the first two, are essential in preparation for all courses in theology, religious education and Christian ethics. Philosophy is really indispensable. For the study of the Bible, church history and history of Christian doctrine, general history and history of philosophy furnish a helpful background. And what about foreign languages? Aside from the large cultural value, Greek is a necessary pre-requisite for the study of the Greek New Testament. Wherever possible, it should be taken in college. Latin is the classical language next in importance. Of modern languages German is decidedly the most valuable, and a student would do well to take enough to give him an easy reading knowledge. French is next in direct value to the student.

College majors and minors should be selected from the above mentioned fields. Specialization in fields that are emphasized in later professional training should be avoided; it is equally unwise to specialize in fields too far removed from the student's professional interest. To sum up: a student looking forward to the ministry should include in his college program English literature and composition, history, Bible, philosophy, including wherever possible ethics, psychology, education, economics or sociology, and, at least, one natural science, biology or geology to be preferred. As to languages Greek and Latin among ancient, and German and French among modern languages, are to be given preference.

These suggestions have grown out of the experience which the writer has had with successive generations of students;

they are presented here because the writer believes that the Conference might make a real contribution to the subject of ministerial training, if some agreement could be reached regarding a pre-theological college course, which, without destroying flexibility and initiative, might be presented to college authorities as well as to college students looking forward to the ministry as their life work, as a guide in the planning of their pre-theological college program.

One other word may be added. Education is a much broader matter than college classes. All that goes to broaden the sympathies, to enrich the mind, to keep one in friendly and helpful contact with one's fellows, and above all, to maintain one's relation with God and the Christian fellowship,—all this belongs to education. That means music and poetry, friendship and nature, worship and service, and a steadfast refusal to let the crowded college days shut one out from the great world of human happenings and human thought as given in the best books and journals of the day. Students should also be encouraged to share in the life of the campus; but they must learn to distinguish between the trivial and the worthwhile, and they should give themselves primarily to those activities that tend to develop personality and capacity for leadership.

The point I would like to emphasize in all this discussion is this: The problem of correlating seminary and college courses finds its most satisfactory solution in the recognition by each of the legitimate sphere of the other. This recognition must be followed by co-operation between the two types of institutions in the arrangement—at least, in a tentative and advisory way—of a continuous course of study that will adequately prepare the graduate of college and seminary to solve the problems and overcome the difficulties which confront the church in the present age and to bring the eternal truth of the gospel to bear with convincing power upon the complex life and relationships today.

FINIS

BV
4019
A5
V.6

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA



PRINTED IN U.S.A.

444827

23-262-002

